

1

2

3

4

5

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

6

GOING-TO-THE-SUN ROAD ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

7

PURSUANT TO THE

8

FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

COMMUNITY BUILDING - WEST GLACIER
GLACIER NATIONAL PARK, MONTANA

20

21

22

23

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 25, 2000
1:45 P.M. TO 5:35 P.M.

24

TUESDAY SEPTEMBER 26, 2000
8:00 A.M. TO 5:00 P.M.

25

1 A P P E A R A N C E S

2 ADVISORY COMMITTEE COORDINATORS:

3 Mary Ansotegui Glacier National Park
 4 Dayna Hudson Glacier National Park

5 ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

6 Linda Anderson Executive Director Glacier Country
 Regional Tourism Commission - Bigfork, MT
 7 Brian Baker Waterton Lakes National Park
 tourism operator - Alberta, Canada
 8 Will Brook President Glacier-Waterton Visitors
 Association - Bozeman, MT
 9 Susie Burch Owner Glacier Park Boat Company -
 Kalispell, MT
 10 Bill Dakin Realtor - Columbia Falls, MT
 David Jackson Economist - University of Montana
 11 School of Forestry - Missoula, MT
 Tony Jewett Regional Director for National
 12 Parks Conservation Association - Helena, MT
 Jayne Kremenik Alberta Community Development -
 13 Alberta, Canada
 Tom McDonald Salish Kootenai Tribes - Pablo, MT
 14 Lowell Meznarch Glacier County Commissioner - Cut
 Bank, MT
 15 Anna Marie Moe State of Montana - Economic Policy
 Advisor to Governor Marc Racicot - Helena, MT
 16 Randy Ogle (Committee Chairman)
 Attorney - OGLE & WORM - Kalispell, MT
 17 Barney O'Quinn Engineer - ARCADIS, Geraghty &
 Miller - Fuquay-Varina, North Carolina
 18 Barbara Pahl Regional Director Mountain/Plains
 Office of National Trust for Preservation - Denver, CO
 19 Paul Sliter Legislative
 Representative/businessman - Somers, MT
 20 Don White Blackfeet Tribe - Browning, MT

21

22 COURT REPORTER:

23 Bambi Goodman, CSR, RPR, CRR Goodman Reporting,
 24 Whitefish, MT

25

1 A P P E A R A N C E S

2 MK CENTENNIAL PERSONNEL:

3 Craig Gaskill Deputy Project Manager -
 4 Transportation Planning - Denver, CO
 5 Jean Townsend Socioeconomic Expert - Denver, CO
 Randy Ritchey Engineering Team - Denver, CO
 Kay Hymas Engineering Team - Denver, CO

6 FEDERAL HIGHWAYS ADMINISTRATION PERSONNEL:

7 Dick Gatten Design Operations Engineer

8 GLACIER NATIONAL PARK PERSONNEL:

9 Suzann Lewis Superintendent
 Fred Babb Project Manager
 10 Steve Frye Chief Ranger
 Jack Gordon Landscape Architect
 11 Mary Riddle Compliance Officer -
 Office of Planning, Design and Construction

12 --o0o--

13 PUBLIC COMMENT:

14 Kelly Harris Skillings-Connolly
 15 Cesar Hernandez Montana Wilderness Association
 Sharlon Willows Coalition for Canyon Preservation
 16 George Gallagher Private Citizen
 Julie Altamus Office of Congressman Rick Hill
 17 Catherine Richter Private Citizen
 Bob Grimaldi Private Citizen
 18 Arthur J. Hoiland Private Citizen
 George Kipp Blackfeet Indian Nation
 19 John Frederick North Fork Improvement Association
 Richard Wackrow North Fork Improvement Association

20

21

22

23

24

25

1	TABLE OF CONTENTS	
2	Monday, September 25, 2000 -	Page
3	Opening Comments and Introductions	6
4	Randy Ritchey -	
5	Road Condition Assessment Report	14
6	Road Condition Assessment Report Discussion	27
7	Fred Babb - Project Status Report	77
8	Project Status Report Discussion	81
9	Craig Gaskill -	
10	Transportation Use Study Report	99
11	Jean Townsend -	
12	Socioeconomic Study Report	100
13	Socioeconomic Study Report Discussion	106
14	--o0o--	
15	Public Comment -	
16	Kelly Harris	115
17	Cesar Hernandez	118
18	Sharlon Willows	121
19	Julie Altamus	125
20	George Gallagher	130
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	TABLE OF CONTENTS	
2	Tuesday, September 26, 2000 -	Page
3	Craig Gaskill - GTSR Conceptual Engineering Alternatives	134
4	Conceptual Engineering Alternatives Discussion	142
5	Work Group Presentation - Group Leaders	158
6	Work Group Consolidation	187
7		
8	--o0o--	
9	Public Comment -	
10	George Gallagher	217
11	Sharlon Willows	222
12	--o0o--	
13	Mary Riddle - Public Involvement Strategy	244
14	Public Involvement Strategy Discussion	247
15	Committee Business Meeting	280
16	--o0o--	
17	Public Comment -	
18	George Kipp	288
19	Sharlon Willows	296
20	John Frederick	297
21	Arthur J. Hoiland	300
22	Bob Grimaldi	300
23		
24		
25		

1 The first day of the second meeting of the
2 Going-to-the-Sun Road Advisory Committee was called to order
3 at 1:45 p.m., September 25, 2000, by Suzann Lewis,
4 Superintendent at Glacier National Park.

5 Ms. Lewis welcomes everyone, including members of
6 the public who are in attendance. She introduces herself,
7 and explains that she and the other Advisory Committee
8 members have just finished taking a tour of the
9 Going-to-the-Sun Road with an overview of it and had a
10 working-in-motion lunch and are back and ready to resume the
11 afternoon agenda. She then turns the meeting over to the
12 chairperson who was elected at the first meeting in February
13 earlier this year, Mr. Randy Ogle.

14 Chairman Ogle, likewise, welcomes the members of
15 the public, thanking them for taking time out of their
16 schedules to attend the meeting and hoping to hear from them
17 later on in the day in the public comment period.

18 Additionally, Mr. Ogle welcomes the Committee
19 members back and welcomes Suzann Lewis in her new status as
20 Park Superintendent. He also thanks the Park Service for
21 the tour of the Going-to-the-Sun Road this morning, stating
22 that was a very informative and valuable. He also thanked
23 the Highway Administration for giving the Committee members
24 a better perspective of the task they're dealing with.

25 Chairman Ogle then moved on to some housekeeping

1 matters which need to be taken care of. The first item is,
2 with regret, that there is a resignation in the Committee.
3 Mary Sexton from Choteau has resigned. She wasn't able to
4 attend this meeting. She had some surgery and some
5 conflicts with her schedule, and she thought since she would
6 miss the meeting, maybe she should not continue. So she has
7 resigned, unfortunately.

8 Mary represents the local business community in
9 the area east of Glacier National Park. That was the area
10 that she was representing as a member of the Committee. Mr.
11 Ogle then turns to Mr. Babb and Ms. Lewis to advise the
12 Committee on the proper procedure for replacing Ms. Sexton
13 on the Committee.

14 Mr. Babb and Ms. Lewis explain that the Park
15 Service will be responsible for contacting the four other
16 individuals who were original nominees along with Ms.
17 Sexton. The first order of business after this meeting will
18 be to contact the remaining four individuals and see if they
19 have an interest and a desire. The Park Service doesn't
20 want to forward somebody's name who isn't interested or who
21 would be surprised by it. Once that individual is decided
22 upon, their name will be forwarded to the Secretary.

23 It's pretty obvious that given the election
24 season, that to get the Secretary's office to act and
25 appoint that person before the next meeting is critical.

1 Because if they miss the next meeting, then there is no
2 point in filling the seat. Because the law requires if you
3 miss two meetings, you're off the Committee anyway. So the
4 Park Service will be following up with that this week. And
5 the individual's name will be sent to the Committee members
6 as soon as the name is submitted to the Secretary's office.

7 It was also discussed that should all four of the
8 original nominees decline appointment, then the Advisory
9 Committee would be allowed to make additional nominees.

10 Chairman Ogle continued on with another
11 housekeeping issue. He spoke of the communication sent to
12 all Committee members in the summer about how the Committee
13 is going to make recommendations to the Park Service,
14 keeping in mind the Committee is an advisory body only.
15 However, when the Committee does make recommendations,
16 should that be by consensus or majority vote in some
17 fashion? Those who did respond to the communication seem to
18 suggest that recommendations be made by consensus. And
19 there one person who said majority vote. A couple of others
20 said consensus, and if you can't reach consensus, then
21 two-thirds or three-quarters majority vote is the way to do
22 it.

23 After some discussion Chairman Ogle reiterated,
24 both from written feedback and also from comments, that the
25 Committee would strive to reach consensus whenever possible.

1 And if consensus can't be reached, then go to a majority
2 vote.

3 Chairman Ogle then opened the floor to further
4 discussion.

5 MS. MOE: I guess my thought -- I would agree
6 that we should go towards consensus. But I think you want
7 more than just a majority vote. Because if we can't reach
8 consensus, part of the reason that we're all on here is
9 representing different interests. And those need to be
10 taken into consideration, if that is indeed the
11 recommendation that comes out. So I think you need more
12 than just a simple majority. If we're that divisive among
13 ourselves, I don't think that recommendation is going to be
14 going forward very fast.

15 CHAIRMAN OGLE: All right. And that was some
16 of the written feedback that I received in response to my
17 request, is that consensus. And if we can't reach
18 consensus, either two-thirds or three-fourths majority vote.
19 So that was the feedback I received consistent with your
20 comments.

21 Any response to that? Tony.

22 MR. JEWETT: Maybe we should chat just a
23 little bit about the nature and form of the recommendations
24 we're going to be providing the Park Service so we have an
25 idea what we're going to be voting on. That would be

1 helpful.

2 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Well, okay. I think that is
3 a good suggestion. There are a number of things. Like, for
4 example, today we're going to be hearing some preliminary
5 findings and some preliminary recommendations in the
6 direction from MK Centennial. And I would think we would be
7 asked today to tell the Park Service whether or not we
8 concur with the initial recommendation option that we'll be
9 hearing from MK Centennial. So I would think those would be
10 the types of things we would be asked to give
11 recommendations on from time to time.

12 And, you know, for the first meeting, we seemed to
13 be able to achieve a consensus fairly readily, even though
14 we haven't been in the first group. And the blurb I sent
15 out in the information I sent out earlier in August, a
16 consensus doesn't mean everybody's within a hundred percent
17 agreement. It means that generally I can support that
18 and -- so I think we will probably have a fairly good chance
19 of reaching a consensus, despite what comes on.

20 Do you want to comment further on that, Suzann or
21 Fred?

22 MS. LEWIS: It's hard to anticipate where
23 your recommendations might spur more diversity of opinion.
24 I would think it might have to do with how -- perhaps, how
25 you would add to or subtract from a recommendation that's

1 been put before you for consideration; that some may want to
2 add things to the recommendation and others might not. I
3 think in the majority of the cases, a recommendation is
4 going to be proposed to this group by consultants who have
5 been looking into it, and then it's a question of how the
6 group wants to accept or modify those recommendations.

7 But there's nothing to prohibit the group from
8 coming up with its own separate, new recommendations.

9 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Does that answer your
10 question?

11 MR. JEWETT: Somewhat. In other words,
12 there's going to be decision points along the way, and the
13 end point is going to be a recommendation from this
14 Committee to the Park Service for the best methodology for
15 reconstructing the road.

16 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Right. And on preliminary
17 recommendations too. We'll hear preliminary recommendations
18 during these meetings, and I think they will want to have
19 some feedback from the Committee on whether or not the
20 direction they are going with these preliminary
21 recommendations is what the Committee thinks they should be
22 pursuing or if we think they should be changed in some way.

23 MR. JEWETT: Thanks.

24 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Other thoughts or comments?

25 It sounds to me like we're shooting for

1 consensus -- making recommendations based upon consensus.
2 But if we can't reach consensus, then probably a little more
3 than a majority vote, two-thirds or three-quarters majority
4 vote is what I'm hearing most of the Committee members
5 saying.

6 Does anybody strenuously oppose that?

7 (No response).

8 MR. DAKIN: We probably really need to decide
9 whether it's a two-thirds or three-quarters or five-eighths.

10 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I agree. Two-thirds is kind
11 of a simple majority between three-quarters --

12 MR. SLITER: Two-thirds would definitely be
13 better than three-quarters.

14 CHAIRMAN OGLE: A consensus plus a two-thirds
15 majority if we can't reach it. All right.

16 And the other housekeeping matter, you recall that
17 there was a suggestion from the Park Service that we have
18 some working committees, subcommittees of our group. And I
19 think everybody -- or most people have responded with their
20 preferences for subcommittees. I thought it might be
21 helpful if we could have either Suzann or Fred talk about
22 what you envision the subcommittee addressing, in terms of
23 the nature of each group. So who's going to do that;
24 Suzann, Fred?

25 MS. LEWIS: I'll start out talking about it.

1 The purpose behind requesting this was to create and involve
2 the Committee members in some -- one of the specific task
3 areas that we have that we're working on, whether it's the
4 socioeconomic, the engineering, one of the other two,
5 visitor transportation and public involvement. And it was
6 so that when the staff and the consultants are going through
7 their work, if they have a small group of two or three
8 individuals that they can call upon to bounce ideas off of
9 to get feedback before formulating it in such a way that we
10 can go out to all the Committee members, that it would be
11 very helpful and would also help you as Committee members to
12 gain an even more -- a little bit more in-depth knowledge in
13 one of those few subject areas.

14 Fred, do you have anything?

15 MR. BABB: The only thing I would add to that
16 is it would give you more direct input, also, to making, we
17 think, the end product better than just of us working on it.

18 --o0o--

19 Chairman thanks Fred and Suzann and then announces
20 the subcommittees each Committee member is to be on, per
21 their request.

22 Linda Anderson, socioeconomic; Brian Baker,
23 socioeconomic; Will Brook, engineering; Susie Burch,
24 transportation; Bill Dakin, engineering/maintenance; David
25 Jackson, socioeconomic; Tony Jewett, transportation/visitor.

1 Jayne Kremenik, socioeconomic; Tom McDonald,
2 transportation/visitor; Lowell Meznarch, public
3 participation; Anna Marie Moe, transportation/visitor; Randy
4 Ogle, transportation/public participation; Barney O'Quinn,
5 engineering; Barbara Pahl, transportation; Paul Sliter,
6 socioeconomic; Don White, socioeconomic.

7 The last housekeeping matter related to the time
8 of the Committee meetings; whether the days scheduled should
9 be in the middle of the week or the end or beginning of the
10 week. After some discussion, it was decided to try and
11 schedule all further meetings either at the beginning or end
12 of the week, not in the middle.

13 --o0o--

14 Whereupon, at 2:00 p.m. Craig Gaskill gave a
15 brief introduction of Randy Ritchey with MK Centennial to
16 present what MK found to be the condition of the road when
17 they conducted their visual inspection.

18 MK had five of their experts up on the road the
19 last week of August, and they represent different fields of
20 engineering. There was drainage, geotechnical, there was
21 structural, roadway, et cetera, et cetera. The person
22 that's been out doing a lot of field fix-up work they spent
23 a week out on the road. They went over the entire road they
24 talked to Park Service personnel, and they made an
25 independent condition assessment of the road to determine

1 what the condition was, kind of verify or unverify what was
2 found in the past, and make a presentation to the Committee
3 so the Committee could understand and ask questions about
4 what was found and how dire the need for improvement is
5 going to do. Mr. Ritchey is MK's senior construction
6 engineer. He was on the road.

7 Mr. Ritchey gave a presentation on the five main
8 areas of concern, drainage, guard walls, structures,
9 geotechnical (a word for soil and rock engineering) and
10 natural hazards such as avalanches and rock fall. The
11 Committee was shown a brief summary, by slides, of the
12 overall condition of the road to give some perspective.

13 The first slide shows the drainage condition.
14 Some rain was falling showing some drainage. From the turns
15 in the road, there is a concentration of the flow of the
16 water. An idea on concentration of flow of water caused by
17 the tilting of the road, which is called superelevation.
18 Perhaps the road doesn't need to be elevated, but perhaps
19 the road should be designed to handle drainage and not
20 superelevation. So if the road is tipped to make the water
21 go where wanted to and not be forced with to live with a
22 superelevation situation.

23 MR. O'QUINN: Aren't you still going to be
24 faced with the problem with the water being confined to the
25 guard wall on one side and the mountain on the other? I

1 think you've still got to get rid of it.

2 MR. RITCHEY: You have to get rid of it, and
3 that's what we'll talk about. You need to put in openings
4 on the wall so it can get more cross-culverts and more
5 culverts and get rid of it gradually in as little -- in as
6 small amounts as we can, rather than concentrating it and
7 trying to get rid of it in a larger quantity all at once.

8 --o0o--

9 Another drainage condition was shown at Overland
10 Bend. Some work has been done up there since the photo was
11 taken which corrected the problem. The slide is showing
12 quite a few places where there were grates across the road.
13 And they are called cross-drains that collect water.
14 Looking underneath one, they are full of debris, and that
15 hinders the drainage. And it shows a lot of the drainage
16 problems are due to maintenance. A situation like this is
17 very difficult to get in there and maintain that so that
18 free-flowing drainage is kept. The grates are only 18
19 inches to two feet wide.

20 A drainage inlet is shown in the next slide. They
21 are right next to the roadway. Probably more of a safety
22 hazard than a drainage problem. There's quite a few places
23 where timbers have been put in front of them to keep cars
24 away from them. Many are right on the edge of the road.

25 The next slide shows pavement with a lot of

1 cracking and it's been sealed and patched. Some of the
2 pavement is in pretty good, fair and poor condition. Most
3 of the pavement problems up there is because of poor
4 drainage. It gets underneath the subbase and can't take it,
5 and that's what causes the pavement deterioration.

6 The next slide shows the subject of rock guard
7 walls. The slide shows two types of stone walls in the
8 foreground. One is on concrete footing, and that's
9 obviously a rehabilitated portion, and then in the
10 background is an original wall. And that's tipping over and
11 leaning. And that situation is very common throughout the
12 park. The guard walls are tipping over. They have been
13 shoved sideways and they have insufficient height. That's
14 probably due to those original stone walls being placed on
15 soil material rather than rock, so they are on a weaker
16 foundation. However, what the slide shows is when the walls
17 are put on a substantial foundation, the wall does not lean.
18 So that is not historic, but it is a fix that seems to be
19 working fairly well.

20 Another structural problem is at one of the
21 arches. It looks like an arch but it's a rectangular
22 concrete box culvert, and the arch is just a facing. The
23 bottom concrete slab and the lines being shown on it are
24 exposed reinforcement steel. And that situation was fairly
25 common on the concrete box culverts. It is believed that is

1 primarily due to abrasion from as the water goes through the
2 culvert very rapidly and is carrying a lot of gravel and
3 rocks over the years, they have abraded the concrete down
4 into the reinforcement steel.

5 MR. O'QUINN: Your guard wall, did you see
6 any occasions where they had used weep holes in them, or are
7 they all just solid wall?

8 MR. RITCHEY: There are weep holes.

9 MR. O'QUINN: Do you see much tipping where
10 you've got weep holes?

11 MR. RITCHEY: I don't know if I can
12 generalize that. Sometimes you do; sometimes you don't.

13 --oOo--

14 Mr. Ritchey continues his presentation showing
15 retaining walls. Guard walls are only a few feet high.
16 Their primary purpose is to keep vehicles from vaulting over
17 the edge of the roadway.

18 The retaining walls have guard walls on top of
19 them. This slide shows the last place the Committee stopped
20 earlier in the day. It shows a fracture line in the
21 retaining wall and the upper portion and bad condition ready
22 to fall out. Further down in the bottom portion, the wall
23 looks fairly good. That is fairly typical of the stone wall
24 throughout the Park; the bottom portion is in better
25 condition than the top portion. And that's good from a

1 structural engineering point of view. Because if the
2 bottoms were distressed, the thinking would be that the
3 whole wall was going to slip out and fail. Whereas, if it
4 was just the top failing, that's bad enough. But it's
5 certainly not as bad as having the bottom kick out from
6 under it.

7 MR. BROOKE: Did you find that to be true,
8 did you say, throughout the road on the retaining walls?
9 Was that the case most of the time?

10 MR. RITCHEY: I would say probably more often
11 than not. The tops -- if there's going to be a problem with
12 the retaining wall, it's usually the top. Now, we did find
13 some where the whole wall, and these were some lower-height
14 walls, where the total wall was in a state of distress.

15 MR. O'QUINN: When I was asking about the
16 weep holes, what I was really questioning was directed at
17 the drainage under it.

18 MR. RITCHEY: Oh, you mean like at the base
19 of the walls like along here?

20 MR. O'QUINN: Even there or all throughout
21 the wall. How is the drainage getting out of there?

22 MR. RITCHEY: I don't know. I don't think it
23 is, in some cases. In some cases it's getting out of there,
24 it's coming through the grout. I saw some historical
25 records which indicated that they did put weep holes at the

1 bottoms of the walls. But I think I only saw one actual
2 weep hole in the field. However, we were only there like
3 three-and-a-half days, so we did not climb down and go over
4 each wall in a lot of detail.

5 But that is an area of concern; that you get water
6 behind a wall, you have to -- you want to relieve that so
7 you don't put that kind of pressure behind the wall. And in
8 some cases, that water is getting out through the grout,
9 which is deteriorating. In other words, it's just seeping
10 right through the wall. That's how it's relieving itself.

11 MR. BROOKE: Was this all visual
12 reconnaissance, or did you do any core samples?

13 MR. RITCHEY: All visual.

14 MR. BROOKE: Do you plan on doing any core
15 samples?

16 MR. RITCHEY: No, that's not in our scope.

17 MR. BROOKE: Would you like to?

18 MR. RITCHEY: Sure. The more we can do, the
19 more we'll understand about it.

20 MR. SLITER: When you were talking about
21 superelevation, was that the term you used?

22 MR. RITCHEY: Yes.

23 MR. SLITER: Did that indicate that the
24 outside, or the rail side, is higher than the mountainside
25 or the opposite? Because the reason I ask is because if the

1 water has more of a tendency to run to the inside and after
2 it passes by the asphalt, you know, the seal, isn't that
3 when it's getting down underneath the surface and then
4 starts to work its way back out toward the outside of the
5 mountain?

6 MR. RITCHEY: In many cases, it is. And
7 whether the wall is higher on the outside or inside depends
8 on which way the curve is going.

9 MR. SLITER: Right; obviously. But is it
10 part of what you were talking about earlier? Is it part of
11 the idea that you try to change the way that the road sits
12 on the mountain?

13 MR. RITCHEY: I believe that's one of the
14 recommendations we'll make in our final report, is that this
15 should be considered. In other words, we think the
16 drainage, as Bob said this morning, drainage is important up
17 here that this road ought to be designed to handle drainage
18 and not necessarily the superelevation effect.

19 MR. BROOKE: Can I ask one more question of
20 core sampling? To follow up on Barney's point about where
21 the water's going and you expressed the concern that if it's
22 sitting behind that wall that would be a real problem.
23 Would core sampling tell you that?

24 MR. RITCHEY: It should, yes. Because you
25 would drill the core and, if you found that the soils behind

1 the wall were saturated, then you would know that you have
2 that case.

3 MR. GASKILL: We can tell the gradation of
4 that soil, what types of soils are in there, and you can
5 tell whether water has been getting in there. This
6 particular wall, I don't know if you were there. Some of us
7 went and looked on the backside. But there's probably a
8 24-inch culvert with a grate on the front. And that culvert
9 has obviously been backed up and clogged at times, and it's
10 been hand shoveled out. Well, when it gets clogged up, you
11 could see it easily gets around the head wall. When it gets
12 underneath the head wall, it goes underneath the road and
13 that's probably what causes it to blow out.

14 --oOo--

15 Mr. Ritchey continues with the lower section of
16 the west side, vegetation growth on a wall close to the
17 Avalanche Creek section. This wall has really good
18 construction, in general. The stones are roughly kind of
19 squared and blocky, and they've been laid on horizontal
20 planes which gives it a lot of strength.

21 However, the purpose of the slide is to show all
22 the vegetation on the wall. There's a lot of moss that is
23 growing on the mortar, quite prevalent throughout the Park,
24 and little plants and, in some cases, even trees starting to
25 grow, trees that are maybe like two or three feet high. But

1 in time, they will get bigger.

2 What the vegetation is going to do is going to
3 deteriorate the mortar over time. And then, over time, the
4 wall as the mortar loses strength, the wall is going to lose
5 strength. And a recommendation that's been made before is
6 that mortar needs to be repointed, which is a mason's term
7 for coming in, chipping out the old mortar at the surface
8 and packing in new mortar.

9 The next slide shows all of the problems combined.
10 It shows drainage problems. The guard wall on top has been
11 knocked off, however the retaining wall down towards the
12 bottom is in better shape. A temporary concrete barrier has
13 been put in front of it which is actually a pretty effective
14 temporary solution. It doesn't look very well, but
15 temporarily, that is a good thing to do and works.

16 The next slide shows the Triple Arches and the
17 problems which are known by FHWA and the Park Service.
18 There's been work done here before, and there are currently
19 plans for more reconstruction there. It's one of the more
20 unique structures at the site along the road.

21 The next slide shows a stone arch. It's a true
22 stone arch culvert. This culvert is just above the Loop.
23 And what is shown is what looks like a fairly good stone
24 culvert. But what is shown on the next slide is that the
25 other half has actually collapsed. And a scene from the

1 inside of the culvert shows the collapsed portion. And some
2 of the voids have a six-foot-long carpenter's rule showing
3 that the void is as much as six feet long. There are cracks
4 and things like that throughout the arch.

5 Where the arch has collapsed, above the road where
6 it's collapsed, there's actually a dip in the road where it
7 has settled and there's been some patching done. This is an
8 area of concern. On the surface of the arch is shown some
9 erosion right underneath the foundation, along with some
10 voids. A hand can actually be stuck in the voids.

11 This slide shows that the arches can fail; that it
12 is possible for them to fail. The middle arch there was the
13 one that had been fixed.

14 Mr. Babb and Mr. Gordon talk about how the fix is
15 available, but there is no money to do it.

16 Mr. Ritchey continues with the geotechnical
17 slides. The next slide shows undercutting of the roadway by
18 the East Tunnel. There is a pretty substantial rock face,
19 but it's probably site cast and dumped the fill over the
20 side. There's no wall here and there's no guard wall, and
21 it's eroding. This is probably one of the more serious
22 situations along the road.

23 The next slide shows in several places there are
24 unstable slopes. Rock and soil is coming down getting into
25 the ditch. On a modern highway design, these things are

1 designed so that the ditch is plenty wide so when the rock
2 comes down it sits in the ditch and later on maintenance can
3 come along. But in the Park, the road is so narrow, the
4 slopes take off the edge of the road so the areas can come
5 down and get on the road and they cause maintenance
6 problems.

7 There are areas of creeping slope. The problem
8 isn't real evident, but the slope keeps creeping over the
9 years and it's causing stress in the roadway. So it's
10 something that is not of immediate concern, but over the
11 years where the slopes are creeping, you will continue to
12 have a little bit of movement. And at some point in time it
13 will cause a little bit more damage than you want to deal
14 with so you're going to have to fix the road.

15 MR. GASKILL: We might point out that the
16 area at the Lake McDonald Road, there's a dip in the road,
17 also a creeping slope, a slow moving slide. Glacial till in
18 this area slowly moves in the area.

19 MR. BAKER: That's a good example of where
20 they put the contract out to fix the piece of the road and
21 they didn't find that, and now you'll have to go back and
22 fix that after that road was down.

23 MR. GASKILL: It will continue to get worse.

24 --o0o--

25 Mr. Ritchey continues with the slides showing

1 hazards. Rock fall hazards are prevalent throughout the
2 road where rock falls off the cliffs up above and, in a lot
3 of cases, falls on the road and has to be pushed off.
4 That's prevalent throughout the road.

5 Up near Overland Bend, some people have heard it
6 referred to as the rim area, there's a lot of rock fall in
7 that area. The Going-to-the-Sun Road here and the trail up
8 above is the Highline trail where people hike. And people
9 can kick rocks and have them come down on the road. Some of
10 the rock fall can come from thousands of feet up on the
11 mountains.

12 Avalanches are, of course, a natural hazard up
13 there. There's approximately 70 identified avalanches.
14 It's a problem that has to be dealt with.

15 Debris flow was looked at in several areas.
16 Intermittent flow where you get a very large sudden storm
17 brings down debris in gullies. There's culverts there that
18 can be plugged up. The debris can come out over the road
19 and be a maintenance problem.

20 Tunnels. The West Tunnel, has a lot of loose rock
21 in the area. Some of the rock is like a veneer. When the
22 tunnel lining was built, it was concrete and then rock was
23 mortared up onto the concrete. So it's not a solid rock.
24 It's a concrete face with rock. And that rock, in a lot of
25 places, is coming off and is or is about ready to come off.

1 The tunnel also has windows with portals in it.
2 And one of the portals has rock which has fallen off. The
3 lining of the tunnel has a lot of cracking in the lining.
4 It appears the cracks are something that happened a long
5 time ago, probably shortly after it was built. There is no
6 indication that those cracks have done anything since they
7 first happened.

8 The East Tunnel is lined, and its lining is in
9 much better condition.

10 The West Tunnel lining is not part of the original
11 tunnel construction. It was a lining that was put in in the
12 late '60s.

13 In conclusion, the road is definitely in a state
14 of deterioration and disrepair, and there's maintenance
15 problems up there, a lot. A lot of the deterioration has
16 been caused by lack of maintenance, particularly in drainage
17 areas. In general, there's a problem which needs to be
18 addressed by continuing funding and engineering studies and
19 continue because there's work up there to be done.

20 Questions are floored.

21 MR. O'QUINN: The items you classified as
22 natural hazards, are they not, in fact, manifestations of
23 geotechnical conditions?

24 MR. RITCHEY: In certain cases. Some of the
25 rock fall is because a cut has been made there in the

1 original construction.

2 MR. O'QUINN: Sounds like it boils down to
3 drainage and geotechnical situations.

4 MR. RITCHEY: What's that?

5 MR. O'QUINN: It sounds like, for the most
6 part, the problem boils down to drainage and geotechnical
7 conditions.

8 MR. RITCHEY: Yes.

9 MS. PAHL: I understand how you can address
10 the drainage problems, but how do you address geotechnical
11 conditions?

12 MR. RITCHEY: Well, like rock fall, some of
13 those areas, one thing that can be done is what's called
14 scaling. People come through with big steel bars, and rock
15 that's about ready to fall off, you make it fall off and
16 knock that rock off, pry it off until we get back to more
17 sound-type rock. That's done with a hazardous operation,
18 but that can be done.

19 Other things would be to try and stabilize slopes
20 that are failing, such as like that creeping slope I
21 mentioned. Craig was talking about those things can
22 sometimes be corrected. Like if there's a -- the reason
23 it's creeping is there's a lot of water in it. You drill
24 some drains in it and let the water get out of there.

25 Some unstable slopes can be tied back by drilling

1 holes back in the firmer material and putting steel rods and
2 cement in there to reinforce it. So there's a lot of
3 different geotechnical things that you can do to stabilize
4 the soil problems.

5 MR. GASKILL: That question came up after we
6 had this field reconnaissance, we all came back and had a
7 week-long meeting. Everybody understood the condition of
8 the road, and I attended that. And this failing rock issue
9 came up. And it was kind of a massive problem in the wake
10 of the National Parks because you see those slopes just
11 going up and up and up.

12 But it turns out the Colorado Department of
13 Transportation is currently undergoing a scaling program
14 within the state. And the reason they started doing that
15 was they realized -- or they feel that it is better to be
16 proactive about at least trying to identify the areas of
17 highest hazard and try and see if there's something they can
18 do about it or not do it and at least make those decisions
19 and look at it. And there are some areas in the state that
20 because of the amount of traffic and the potential for rock
21 fall, that they are doing some rock scaling and they're
22 putting some rock protector coming.

23 MS. PAHL: Those big nets that they have.

24 MR. GASKILL: That's probably not appropriate
25 for here. But just in terms of aspects, it may be

1 appropriate in the areas that are exposed, where you're
2 going to get most of the weather and that's where the rock
3 is weakest on the outside, mostly in new cuts, that there
4 may be the most likely place for the rock to start falling
5 off. Which most of that area is along the actual rock cut
6 itself. It may be appropriate to go in there and do a
7 maintenance fix. You'd have to get some type of funding for
8 that, but maintenance fix to do scaling just to map that
9 area. And if you drive up there next time you notice in our
10 van -- we didn't have enough time to talk about it -- but
11 you'll see areas along that rock wall where there are clear
12 gaps between the wall and some rocks in the front. And that
13 would be an area that you might consider scaling as a fix.

14 The other thing that came up during that
15 discussion, in terms of things you can do right now, I think
16 Bob mentioned this, was the drain ditch. Get out there and
17 try to fit these, get these -- all these culverts cleaned
18 out. I think Bob said that two-thirds of the drainage
19 structures are -- have some type of material in them right
20 now. They really need -- that drainage is a big issue. You
21 get those things cleaned out. They don't even have enough
22 manpower to clean them out every year, and they fill up
23 pretty quick. But to get those things cleaned out on a
24 maintenance thing is trying to make things run in the
25 existing condition.

1 We identified this arch. That's one of the things
2 the Federal Highway identified. That's one of many critical
3 areas that they've identified. I was down there. Randy was
4 showing it to me because I wanted to check this out. I was
5 down there and stuck my arm through the wall. You shouldn't
6 be able to stick your arm through a retaining wall and have
7 traffic above it and see water coming out. So I think there
8 are some other critical areas that probably need to be
9 fixed. These are just fixing critical areas. Something
10 could seriously happen on those.

11 There was a fourth one. What was the fourth one
12 we were thinking about? Those were three recommendations, I
13 think, are at least important in terms of whether you want
14 to do something right away.

15 The thing I think that I came out of that with
16 was, after we heard the last meeting that the Federal
17 Highway Administration was identifying most critical areas,
18 I kind of questioned Well, if they're identifying the most
19 critical areas, is there that need to fix that road right
20 now? If they're taking care of those things, maybe it's
21 okay. When they came back, and after looking at that, I
22 think our conclusion is that yeah, this road needs a lot of
23 help. It's not something that you can just let go and fix
24 on a critical basis.

25 You've got to put a lot of work on it to get this

1 thing back up to standards, and build so it that you can
2 maintain it over the long period. It's something that
3 really does have an urgent need to get done. It's more than
4 just maintenance. It's significant things. Just for the
5 fact they're finding something every time they go up there,
6 some new void that's opened up. It's gotten to the point
7 where you're going to find more and more of these things. I
8 think the urgency is there to get something done, much more
9 so than I even thought last time. That's what I came out of
10 after spending the week with these guys.

11 MR. BROOKE: There's something here that's
12 troubling me a little bit, though. And if I look at your
13 briefing paper on the engineering study, I look at the last
14 paragraph on the first page, and it says "The condition of
15 the Going-to-the-Sun Road will be observed visually and no
16 testing will be made. It is recognized that certain
17 conditions may be hidden from view or inaccessible. The
18 general condition assessment will be made and no assertion
19 will be made that all inadequacies, defects or deficiencies
20 will be or can be detected."

21 I understand that. But something I heard today in
22 driving around with the Park Superintendent ties into this
23 that makes me wonder and bothers me. And that is, the Park
24 Service admits that they're up there working on things that
25 they think are high priority or critical, but they're not

1 sure if what they're doing is going to last for seven years
2 or if the project they're working on is going to fail
3 tomorrow.

4 So on the one hand, we have a hard time setting
5 priorities because we really don't know what the problem is
6 that we're fixing sometimes, we just think that they're
7 critical areas. But when you start saying We're just going
8 to make visual reconnaissance here, I mean, that was kind of
9 how this whole board got started in the first place, in my
10 view, was that we were not satisfied with the Park Service
11 and the Federal Highway's assessment of the problem. We all
12 agree there's a problem up there. But where to start, what
13 ones are the priorities, which I kind of expected would come
14 out of this. And then I hear we're just going to do
15 reconnaissance because it's outside the scope of our work.

16 If you need to do more testing and use more
17 sophisticated equipment, I would expect that we would hear
18 that so that we could say Look, before we dive off over this
19 cliff and start doing things, ought not we know whether
20 they're the right things, that we're doing them in the right
21 place, that we're doing them in the right priorities. And
22 I'm not hearing that right now. And maybe that's a flaw in
23 the way this thing was set up.

24 MR. GASKILL: Well, one of the things that we
25 felt we needed to do -- we know there's been a lot of work

1 done out there with the Federal Highway Administration. We
2 knew there were concerns that maybe the right things hadn't
3 been identified, or everyone wasn't sure that the needs were
4 what they thought they were. So we wanted to see whether
5 what they had done seemed reasonable or not reasonable. For
6 us to spend the amount of time that they had already spent
7 out there and do the testing, you would have spent your
8 entire budget on this just doing this testing of the road.
9 And obviously, there was limitations on budget, and so we
10 had to try to maximize what we could with the budget we had.
11 And we had a lot of other things to do as well. So we felt
12 that by going out there, getting some experts in those
13 various areas in the condition of the road, what we were
14 trying to do was identify what's needed to fix the road and
15 how bad is it; what are the critical areas that will affect
16 the rehabilitation of that road so we could come up with
17 alternatives to rehabilitate it.

18 But in terms of coming up with a full -- what's
19 called a scope and reconnaissance report, identifying every
20 specific problem on the road is something that's, it's
21 probably a year-and-a-half worth of time and a very detailed
22 effort. You'd have to crawl in each one of those and do
23 geotechnical efforts in each one of those. And I don't know
24 where you're going to get the money for that, but it's
25 something that I guess you just can't afford at this point.

1 MR. BROOKE: But I don't mean every specific
2 problem. I realize that everybody has to be reasonable
3 about what the resources here are and what can be done. But
4 I mean, if we're going to waste money fixing stuff that A,
5 doesn't need to be fixed, or we're fixing things in the
6 wrong priority because this area down here should have been
7 fixed first and we would have known that had we spent a
8 little more time and money evaluating that -- I guess to put
9 them right on the hot seat, are you comfortable making
10 recommendations based on visual analysis of what's out
11 there?

12 MR. RITCHEY: General recommendations. To
13 get into specific design like a specific solution, you can't
14 make a -- design a specific solution around just a general
15 observation. But you can make the general observation such
16 as the retaining walls are better at the bottom than at the
17 top, so that that affects when we do constructability
18 analysis and scheduling and funding of how much work is
19 involved there.

20 MR. BROOKE: So would one of your
21 recommendations be, before we start fixing the archway,
22 we're going to core sample it to understand what it is that
23 needs to be done? I don't know if that's the right -- if
24 core sampling has anything to do with this or not, but just
25 by way of example.

1 MR. RITCHEY: You have to take those on kind
2 of a case-by-case basis to see what additional studies and
3 engineering need to be done to develop a solution. And in
4 most cases, like I said, you need to do additional work to
5 come up with a specific solution that you can prepare plans
6 and specification for and give it to a contractor and say
7 Here, go build it.

8 MR. BROOKE: Is that in here?

9 MR. RITCHEY: Developing plans and
10 specifications? No.

11 MR. GASKILL: We're quite a ways after that.
12 After this step -- what this step is intended to come up
13 with is what are your rehabilitation alternatives? What's
14 acceptable to the community and to the Glacier National Park
15 and will address the problems that are out there. And there
16 are problems out there; we've identified that.

17 Once you go to that point, you have to do your EIS
18 or your NEPA process, whatever that might be. And it looks
19 like it might be EIS at this point. And that's when you
20 start looking at the -- we get a lot more detail at that
21 point. But even at the NEPA process, you don't normally
22 even go into core drilling at that point. You're not even
23 at that point at the NEPA process. You do a lot of work in
24 terms of the economic analysis and the historical and the
25 environmental process.

1 And then usually somewhere in the later part of
2 the NEPA process, or after you sign the decision, you'll
3 start doing that design work. And it kind of depends upon
4 what you find in the NEPA process what kind of design work
5 you do during that. But a lot of times you need the design
6 work during that point. So the design work usually
7 comes -- it's still a ways down the road. What the Federal
8 Highways is doing right now is they're doing things that are
9 so critical that they have to do them now. So they've done
10 the environmental document to clear that specific project.
11 What we need is an environmental document to clear the
12 entire project so we have an overall appointment.

13 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Other questions for Craig?
14 Fred.

15 MR. BABB: Can I add a little bit to what
16 Craig is saying? In 1998, I think it was, Will, we did a
17 rim study which -- "we," meaning the Federal Highway, looked
18 at the condition of the whole road. And we continue to look
19 at that as our Bible for the condition of the road. And
20 then in addition to that, we started a wall inventory, I
21 guess it was, in '97. And then every year we relook at the
22 walls. And then with the wall surveys, our dilemma is every
23 year those walls change. New ones that are eroded out,
24 whether it be from a landslide, a drainage as Randy was
25 saying, but they consistently change and new things come up.

1 So we're dealing with all that, I guess. And then
2 once we identify a critical section of wall, either during
3 that whole process we do go in and do borings. In other
4 words, like the arches or the retaining -- the avalanche
5 resistance wall, like you saw this morning. Before we went
6 in and finalized that fix and everything, we did core
7 sampling, as like Craig was saying, as part of our design
8 process.

9 But it starts out either with RIPS study which is
10 mechanical, which is a machine that measures pavement stress
11 and all those things and/or visual, testing the outside
12 section of the wall. If we find a bad section, then we go
13 into greater detail before we spend any design and
14 construction money.

15 And what we've asked MK is more or less what Craig
16 has said. Is the process that we're using, does it make
17 sense and the findings to date so far that Federal Highway
18 has worked with the Park Service, does that make sense? Do
19 we have that problem that we think out there? Are we
20 approaching it right or should we be going some other
21 direction?

22 Your point is well taken, though, is do we need
23 additional -- any information now to deal in the planning
24 arena where we are now. But we're definitely not in the
25 design arena yet.

1 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I was having the same problem
2 Will was, though, after reviewing the briefing papers.
3 Everything is visual. And basically, MK Centennial has
4 looked at the previous data that's out there and has spent
5 three days looking at the road, and I thought what we were
6 looking for at the end of this process was some specific
7 recommendations for solutions from MK Centennial.

8 I'm not sure how specific solutions for things
9 that are so important to the structural integrity of this
10 road can be made just from visual observations and reading
11 studies. So that confused me a little bit, I guess.
12 Because it seems to me a little inconsistent with what I
13 thought was going to be happening. Maybe it was just a
14 misunderstanding on my part.

15 MR. GASKILL: I think the things that based
16 on the visual assessment of the road and the review of the
17 works, I think one thing that's obvious to us is that you
18 need to do some maintenance. You need to do more
19 maintenance than what's out there right now, and you
20 probably need to do some immediate maintenance, at least at
21 some of those drainage structures.

22 MR. O'QUINN: Randy, along the same lines, I
23 wasn't looking for a design. But this is not a typical
24 NEPA-type study; you're right. You don't usually have an
25 engineering study and socioeconomic study funded prior to

1 it. But that's the way this is going about.

2 And what I was expecting was not solutions but
3 more definitive answers as to what the problems are. I ride
4 the road one time and can tell you you got drainage
5 problems. I know there are drainage problems, and I know
6 there's geotechnical problems. But I don't know what's
7 causing the drainage problems. I've got some ideas. Sure,
8 if you've got stopped up culverts you've got -- that's
9 really causing the drainage problem. But first of all,
10 before you come up with a solution, you've got to know what
11 the problem is. Otherwise -- and I think that's what Will
12 was referring to. You can spend good money patching
13 something up, and two years later you got to patch it up
14 again because the solution didn't get to the problem.

15 And that's where I think, from what I've seen of
16 the study thus far, we're short. We know we got drainage,
17 but what are the drainage problems? And that's what I was
18 looking for. Not how to fix them, necessarily, not a
19 design --

20 MR. BROOKE: Right.

21 MR. O'QUINN: -- but are they these kinds of
22 problems or this kind? And that was the question about the
23 weep holes. I've got an intuitive feeling that water's
24 getting trapped behind those walls. But I don't know that.
25 And it's going to take some testing to find out. And I

1 think that's what all three of us are kind of talking about.

2 And I understand what your scope of work is. And
3 they were my comments with regard to the scope of work when
4 I reviewed the scope. Again, I wasn't positively sure
5 exactly what the Park Service was looking for there in the
6 budget you had to work with. But for the magnitude of the
7 problem we're talking about here, I don't think visual
8 reconnaissance is going to give us the answers.

9 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Are there comments or
10 questions?

11 David.

12 MR. JACKSON: Yeah. In the last thing that I
13 saw for the scope of work was the draft of July 20. And
14 under the engineering study it said develop feasible
15 alternatives with costs and schedules for rehabilitation
16 GTSR. And I guess I'm asking you what kind of costs can you
17 come up with, with the three-day reconnaissance?

18 MR. GASKILL: Well, we can come up with -- we
19 can come up with planning level costs, costs that you can
20 look at different alternatives so you can make
21 recommendations on what those alternatives are. We can make
22 an estimate of -- based on what we know and the information
23 that's already been collected by Federal Highway
24 Administration, of how many walls need to be fixed; what the
25 fixes are; how long does it take to fix those things; which

1 is, I think, a big issue on that; how much pavement has to
2 be rehabilitated, and a pretty good planning estimate that
3 you could put in a long-term program and be within -- know
4 whether alternative A is better than alternative B and what
5 the relative difference is. We couldn't come up with an
6 engineering cost, by any means, for what we've done. And
7 certainly we didn't expect to come up with an engineering
8 cost. But that's something that we will be doing as we
9 develop these alternatives and produce the report.

10 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Bill?

11 MR. DAKIN: A question to Randy as we were
12 going there -- I mean, there are areas up there that
13 probably just don't need much work, that are carved right
14 into bedrock ledges and maybe have foot-thick pavement on
15 them. Have you any idea -- and when we talk about
16 reconstructing the hill section, the alpine section, I think
17 so many of us think it's a foot-by-foot, yard-by-yard
18 process. But there must be areas that really don't need a
19 whole lot of work.

20 And do you have any quantitative sense of what
21 that is. Proportion is maybe a 30 percent of that whole
22 section that really is going to need just a minimal kind of
23 surface treatment in order to have it have a 50-year
24 survivability?

25 MR. RITCHEY: I don't have any

1 quantity -- quantitative information right now. We did take
2 notes in the field. We have some mapping. We're going to
3 be getting some inventory data from the Park Service, and we
4 will be looking at that over the next few months. Right
5 now, I guess, I don't have the numbers that I can throw out.

6 MR. DAKIN: Do you think there will be even a
7 substantial amount of it that will need a cosmetic overhaul
8 and then we skip on to the next major subbase level.

9 MR. RITCHEY: Well, I don't know what you
10 mean by "substantial," but there is areas where they are in
11 pretty good shape. The drainage needs to be maintained or
12 graded a little bit differently. Those guard walls, they're
13 leaning. In some cases it's more of an esthetic problem
14 than a true structural problem. So there are areas where
15 it's not as severe as the other areas. It's not like you
16 need to tear the whole road down and start over and put a
17 new one in. No. Because there are substantial areas that
18 are okay or that just need minor amounts of work.

19 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Are there other questions
20 for Randy or Craig?

21 Susie?

22 MS. BURCH: In view of all these comments,
23 I'm just wondering, when we're doing our mitigation
24 strategies and other socioeconomic things, are we going to
25 have -- how much confidence or how much range will we be

1 dealing with in a time frame, based on the parameters of
2 this engineering study, scoping session, whatever? I mean,
3 are we going to end up walking away saying Well, we're
4 planning a mitigation study for a three-to-five-year project
5 or a five-to-fifteen-year project? To me that has a huge
6 impact on how we -- I think on what we're ultimately going
7 to be considering and recommending.

8 MR. GASKILL: That's a good question.
9 Because obviously, the more detail you put in there in
10 determining exactly what the problems are, the more
11 certainty you can come up with recommendations and just how
12 long it's going to be. There will be some range just
13 because even though you don't know everything until you've
14 done design. And design takes a lot more work than we've
15 done to date. But there is a lot of information out there.
16 And everything that we have done seems to verify that what's
17 been done in the past is pretty good. It's just it hasn't
18 really gotten out to everyone. But what's been done is in
19 pretty good shape.

20 So we have a pretty good idea what walls need to
21 be fixed. And they have this updated wall program that
22 they're doing every year. Now we've been out there, we have
23 a pretty good confidence, from everything that we can tell,
24 it looks like what they're telling us is pretty much what we
25 found. So I think there's more information that we can come

1 up with a pretty good not only cost estimate but time
2 estimate than just our three-and-a-half-day assessment when
3 we're out there. I couldn't tell you what that range is,
4 but I think it's better than three to five years. It's
5 probably going to be -- it could be if we have an
6 alternative that was five years, it might be five years or
7 might be five-and-a-half years. That's just my gut feeling
8 with our range of talking there.

9 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Do you think you have enough
10 information, from what you reviewed and your three-day
11 assessment, to know the sources of the problems that are
12 causing these visual things that need to be fixed?

13 MR. GASKILL: I guess I should refer to Randy
14 on that one.

15 MR. RITCHEY: In general, I think we do.

16 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Other questions?
17 Tony?

18 MR. JEWETT: Craig, I've just been going
19 through some of the materials that were handed out, and I
20 just want to make sure I understand. The schedule that
21 you're on, MK Centennial is on here, I was looking at the
22 study elements, study approach. And -- which has got
23 detailed field reconnaissance review. And then you've got a
24 constructability workshop and then engineering alternative.
25 Can you put some dates on these, or maybe you handed out a

1 time table before. I just wanted to find out when these
2 outputs are going to be made available to us.

3 MR. GASKILL: The field review, that was the
4 last week of August. We had scheduled a constructability
5 workshop. That was two weeks ago. And that was to listen
6 to --

7 MR. JEWETT: That was your week-long
8 workshop.

9 MR. GASKILL: That was the week-long workshop
10 to look at how we might address the deficiencies that we
11 found out there. After we got into that, we realized we
12 needed to understand those deficiencies to the entire team,
13 and we had a lot of discussion about the deficiencies and
14 what was causing the deficiencies. Obviously, there was a
15 lot more discussion talked about than what we had today.

16 So we feel we still need to do a constructability
17 workshop, which we actually identified two weeks ago. We
18 still think we need to do that. And bring the contractors
19 in and talk about how we can get equipment out there; what
20 different techniques there are available; innovative
21 techniques to try to minimize your construction time and
22 your impacts on the roadway based on what those
23 deficiencies; what needs to be done. So we're pretty close
24 to getting the report complete that has a description of
25 what all the deficiencies are, which you heard a summary of

1 today. Once we do that, we'll get the constructability
2 workshop done, then probably get something set up is
3 probably another three weeks away.

4 Then we want to have, either as part of that or
5 separate, have a workshop or discussion to talk about the
6 staging -- construction staging issues. I should refer to
7 it as rehabilitation staging issues associated with that.
8 That's one of the big factors, that's the schedule of the
9 rehabilitating the road. So we want to get together and
10 talk about that, because that affects not only the roadway
11 but affects the transportation and visitor use opportunities
12 as well. And that's probably a couple weeks beyond that.
13 Then we're going to put together alternatives based on what
14 we get from the Advisory Committee and the Park this week.
15 And we plan on having a draft for that -- I think it's April
16 6th we have in our schedule right now.

17 MR. JEWETT: And that's the engineering
18 alternatives and report.

19 MR. GASKILL: That will be a little bit
20 before your next meeting in May, I believe. And that will
21 give you an opportunity to look at that before May and
22 discuss that, and, hopefully, come back with some
23 recommendations based upon those alternatives so we can put
24 together what we'll call a final report in June. That's
25 really our schedule. And that's pretty much the end of what

1 we're doing or hope to do in June, would be our final
2 report.

3 MS. PAHL: Maybe this is a question for the
4 Park, but when are you going to start doing the compliance
5 with the Section 106?

6 MR. BABB: We're going to talk about that in
7 the next presentation after break, and then we're going to
8 come up with -- we have a section dedicated to that. But in
9 essence, where we are now, we did the Notice of Intent, and
10 we plan to have meetings in November. We decided to hold
11 off after that this month's meeting and then do it after
12 this meeting which would be October-November time frame.

13 And we're going to cover the money, because we're
14 still hanging on with regards to the and EIS. And there are
15 some decisions that have to be made in terms of how we
16 involve the public or the technical documents. And we're
17 going to talk -- we're going to set the stage, sort of, in
18 the next section, but then we'll talk in detail about that
19 on Tuesday afternoon with Mary Riddle, when she's here.

20 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Other questions, comments?
21 Suzann?

22 MS. LEWIS: Maybe to respond to Barb's
23 question about 106, the National Historic Preservation Act
24 compliance a little more specifically. You know, clearly,
25 the recommendations that this group gives would be one

1 aspect of what would be put into that package and sent to
2 the SHIPO and Advisory Council. But I think, again, until
3 we have a little bit more of an idea on design, I don't
4 think we can go forward with 106 compliance until this
5 project would be entering into its design phase.

6 MR. BABB: To add to that, I should have
7 mentioned that. But to add to that, we've met with the
8 SHIPO once, briefing them on the jobs that we're doing this,
9 being one of two jobs we briefed them on. And it's laid out
10 the discussion, but we haven't done further with that.

11 MS. PAHL: One further question on design. I
12 know when you were talking about the rubble walls and using
13 the slides, you commented that the reconstructed walls were
14 in better condition than the historic walls. What -- in
15 terms of how you view those walls, how is that going to
16 influence your design decision about what you do with the
17 historic walls?

18 MR. GASKILL: Are you talking about the guard
19 walls that Randy pointed out with foundation?

20 MR. RITCHEY: Well, to a certain extent, we
21 need feedback on what is historically significant and what
22 are some of the historical guidelines. Like I said, you
23 know, that concrete footing seems to be working pretty good.
24 But that was something done probably in the '60s; I'm not
25 sure, I'm guessing. And generally, you cannot see that from

1 the roadway side. You can see it from the other side, if
2 you get out and walk across the wall. But is that going to
3 be acceptable, historically, or not? I guess we need input
4 from the historical/cultural part of this study, us
5 engineers. We need that input so we have some criteria.

6 MR. GASKILL: You know what, Mark gave the
7 presentation. And one of the reasons is to come up with
8 basically a plan of what we can and can't do. Us as
9 engineers, we don't know what we can and can't do in terms
10 of that. I know what I'd like to look at, but that's --
11 when it comes to historical stuff, we need input. I think
12 that that's going along, also, with that section.

13 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Music to your ears.

14 MS. PAHL: I think we need to talk about what
15 standards it's going to be, whether it's going to be the
16 restoration or rehab standards.

17 MR. RITCHEY: We can give you some options of
18 some different ideas; this is something we think will work.
19 And then from the historical/cultural part of it, they can
20 look at that and say Well, yeah, this seems like it would
21 satisfy the intent of the historical/cultural, or maybe say
22 No, maybe that's a good engineering solution, but it doesn't
23 satisfy what we want historically and culturally.

24 MS. PAHL: Different parts will be different
25 solutions.

1 MR. RITCHEY: Different places will be
2 different solutions.

3 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Barney.

4 MR. O'QUINN: Craig, going back to the
5 engineering study, my impression from our February meeting,
6 our task or scope or the first phase of that part of it, was
7 to do an inventory of the work that has been done, which you
8 have done. All the stuff that FHWA and the Park Service or
9 whoever. It was review the literatures.

10 MR. GASKILL: And we had done that.

11 MR. O'QUINN: Right. But I also thought that
12 after that and after some field reconnaissance or field
13 work, you were going to make specific recommendations as to
14 engineering tasks that needed further investigations before
15 carrying it forward either to the study stage or the design
16 stage. And I haven't heard that. And I think that's kind
17 of one of the things that we've all been talking about.

18 You've identified our areas where you've got
19 drainage problems or geotechnical problems, but I haven't
20 heard any recommendations that additional investigations, of
21 whatever type, need to be done there to investigate that
22 problem to come up with a solution for it. And that's the
23 gap that I'm finding in the study.

24 MR. GASKILL: Okay. I guess the way we saw
25 it was, after our review of the material, was there

1 information that was missing? Was there something that
2 hadn't been covered? Was there something that still had to
3 be done, in terms of engineering analysis or investigation.

4 MR. O'QUINN: Exactly.

5 MR. GASKILL: Something that we couldn't meet
6 engineering recommendations for alternatives without that
7 information. It turns out that there's a lot of work that
8 has been done. We just hadn't seen it because there's no
9 document anywhere that just has it in that one spot.

10 MR. O'QUINN: So you're comfortable that
11 there's enough preliminary engineering investigation been
12 done that you can move forward with it, without making
13 recommendations for additional testing.

14 MR. GASKILL: We're comfortable that there's
15 enough information at this point to make those alternative
16 recommendations. In fact, we were surprised at how much
17 information had been done. When we started getting into it,
18 how much work had been done in the past by Federal Highway
19 Administration and National Park Service, and everything we
20 looked at just wasn't immediately obvious or available; that
21 we started researching and it was there. And we actually
22 ended up talking quite a bit to different members of or
23 different staff people, about how much information that they
24 just knew in their head. That provided a lot of information
25 to us that we wouldn't have known otherwise.

1 So we do feel comfortable that there's enough
2 information from what we know, at this point, to at least
3 make the alternatives. Now, certainly not the design. So
4 if you're looking for design recommendations, we don't know
5 that.

6 MR. O'QUINN: No.

7 MR. DAKIN: Did you come onto that fairly
8 late in the summer then? Because the draft that you had
9 sent out to us in late June, I thought the sense of that was
10 that you weren't finding a lot of quantitative material or
11 specific material.

12 MR. GASKILL: There wasn't a lot of
13 quantitative material written down. And there still isn't a
14 lot of quantitative material written down. What we found is
15 that we're expecting a report that said This is what we're
16 hoping for, This is what's wrong with the road and This is
17 what needs to be fixed with the road and This is the
18 location of that. That report doesn't exist. It's not out
19 there right now. So what we wanted to do was identify what
20 those issues were, where they were along the road.

21 And our report that we're putting together marks
22 the concerns that we saw; where they're at on the road,
23 where they've been mapped in terms of milepoints on the
24 road. But then we found out, from talking to the staff,
25 that the information that they had gone through and the

1 information that had they had done, that was available
2 through their planning workshops was much more than was
3 written down any place. So we were able to gain a lot of
4 information from that.

5 And there are some white papers. When you start
6 asking questions, you start finding these little white
7 papers and memorandums that they put out. But what we
8 didn't find was that report. And we found -- I think we
9 found a lot of stuff in late June when we were talking to
10 people.

11 MR. O'QUINN: Are you bringing all that
12 together and putting it in your report?

13 MR. GASKILL: Well, what we're putting
14 together as a report is basically a summary of what we found
15 on the road and where those locations are.

16 MR. O'QUINN: But what about the work that
17 the Park Service and the Federal Highway Administration has
18 done that hasn't been documented? And you documented that
19 in your report?

20 MR. GASKILL: No.

21 MR. O'QUINN: So it's still just riding
22 around in somebody's head then.

23 MR. GASKILL: That stuff isn't down there for
24 us to document what somebody else said. We want to document
25 what we found and feel comfortable about it, which is what

1 we're doing. So we're going to have not a reconnaissance
2 and scoping report, but it's a report that we think shows
3 the deficiencies of the road, we feel comfortable with that,
4 and what are the problems of the road and what we think can
5 be done to fix it, in terms of a planning-level perspective.

6 MR. BABB: But in answer to Barney's
7 question, a lot of that is from verbal discussions with
8 folks. You are documenting what you found out in the
9 process, like the meeting we had during the week of the
10 11th. So that becomes documented.

11 MR. GASKILL: Yeah, yeah.

12 MR. O'QUINN: It becomes part of the
13 administrative record.

14 MR. GASKILL: Yes. I guess we've documented
15 what we found. We're just not putting all that stuff in the
16 report.

17 MR. O'QUINN: But it will be in your files.

18 MR. GASKILL: It will be in our files. In
19 fact, we've got -- I don't know how many sheets of notes we
20 have, but it is an amazing amount of information that's out
21 there. For example, the retaining walls. You look at the
22 retaining wall inventory, there's a lot of, I guess,
23 quantitative information regarding retaining walls, length
24 and height and priorities. But it doesn't really talk about
25 what is the real problem with those retaining walls and why

1 they're failing and how should they be fixed. The inventory
2 doesn't have a detail, when you start talking about FHWA.
3 You realize well, obviously, they know what the issues are.
4 But you find out what the answers are, what's causing those
5 retaining walls to fail, how they need to be fixed, and what
6 the obligations are.

7 MR. O'QUINN: Well, where I'm headed, at some
8 point in time there's going to need to be a purpose and need
9 for an environmental document. And we need to know what's
10 wrong with the retaining walls, not just that there's
11 something wrong with them. What's causing the failure.
12 Now, are you going to capture that in what you're doing?

13 MR. GASKILL: I guess to the point -- yeah.
14 I mean, we're going to capture what's wrong with the
15 roadway.

16 MR. O'QUINN: But what you said was that in
17 the Federal Highway Administration work that they had done,
18 you had the length and the height and the walls were in poor
19 repair. But they did not say what was wrong with the walls.
20 But yet you're saying that you feel comfortable in making
21 recommendations on the information you have. Can you now
22 tell us what's wrong with the walls?

23 MR. GASKILL: Can you tell us what's wrong
24 with the walls? I think we can tell you that the walls that
25 need to be repaired need to be repaired.

1 MR. O'QUINN: We can look at that and see
2 that. But why.

3 MR. GASKILL: We can't tell you every single
4 wall why. But we understand why a lot of the walls are
5 failing. A lot of it is that drainage. But we don't know
6 that every wall is failing because of drainage. I mean,
7 that's stuff we don't know without doing a lot more work.

8 MR. O'QUINN: But do you need to go and
9 investigate the walls enough to know that they are failing
10 because of drainage before you start working on the walls?
11 And work on the drainage? Before you fix the walls.

12 MR. GASKILL: I think we need to know enough
13 to be able to make those recommendations how to fix it. And
14 from what I've heard, I guess I feel we have enough. I
15 guess, we think it's primarily drainage.

16 MR. O'QUINN: That's my question. Is your
17 report. You said that your basic source of information was
18 FHWA report, which reported the problem but didn't say what
19 the problem was. Are you carrying it to the next level to
20 tell us what is the problem?

21 MR. GASKILL: I'd say for the walls, there's
22 a lot of information. The walls is one of the sources, the
23 wall inventory. For those walls, that we'll be able to
24 identify which walls are priority one, priority two,
25 priority three, and which wall and how long and how high and

1 where they are. What we've been able to determine or get a
2 good planning level feel is the main cause of those -- the
3 main problem with those walls is there's some washing out at
4 the bottom. There's some hydrostatic pressure or water
5 pressure behind those walls that's blowing out the grout in
6 between. They're not really being caused by geotechnical
7 problems. There's not landslides coming out. They're
8 generally on fairly solid foundations.

9 MR. O'QUINN: Is your report going to include
10 that type of information, what you just told me? That's my
11 question.

12 MR. GASKILL: I believe it is. But I guess I
13 should confirm that.

14 MR. RITCHEY: We'll have that type of
15 information. I don't know to what level of detail that you
16 might be expecting it. But we'll have that kind of
17 information there to give us a level of detail that we can
18 do this planning study.

19 I had -- before I came up here, I had similar
20 questions that you just asked. There's a report that says
21 Here's a wall that needs to be fixed or it's failing. Well,
22 looking at that I couldn't tell what's wrong with the wall.
23 I came up here.

24 MR. O'QUINN: Did it get hit by a bulldozer
25 or --

1 MR. RITCHEY: I came up here, started looking
2 around. If we would be seeing massive slope failures, rocks
3 coming out of the walls or what. So we came up here and we
4 looked at them and, in general, the walls were probably in
5 better condition than I was afraid that they might be.
6 Particularly at the bases they're in pretty good condition.
7 There is some erosion at the base of the tops of the walls,
8 walls like you can see that. A lot of the walls have a
9 problem with the top five or six feet. And the repointing
10 with the mortar in the walls is bad because there's all that
11 vegetation. So we certainly have a better handle on
12 what's -- what the problem is with those walls and what it
13 might take to fix it than before we came up here.

14 MS. PAHL: Are you including in your possible
15 causes -- we talked about drainage, you talked about
16 geotechnical. Especially when you talk about the walls
17 being good at the bottom and a lot of concerns at the top,
18 are you including the possibility that some of the walls are
19 in bad shape because of the snow plowing and removal effort?

20 MR. RITCHEY: Bob has told us that he
21 believes that the top of the walls was due to maintenance
22 practices on clearing the wall every year. That's good,
23 useful information that we did not use last year because
24 we've come up here, looked at the walls, and we have that
25 information. So we'll crank that into our analysis and

1 report.

2 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Other questions for Randy or
3 Craig?

4 All right. Is there any further discussion,
5 before we take a break, on the MK Centennial condition or
6 assessment report or the field reconnaissance efforts that
7 they have made from any members of the Committee? All
8 right. I think they've been good questions, and I think
9 that a lot of the concerns of the Committee have been
10 expressed.

11 So if there's nothing further at this point, why
12 don't we take a break for fifteen minutes.

13 (Proceedings in recess from 3:15 p.m. to
14 3:30 p.m.)

15 Chairman Ogle advises the Committee members that a
16 daily running summary of decisions made by the Committee is
17 being produced by the Park staff for the Committee members'
18 use until the court reporter transcript is obtained. The
19 first of such summaries is being distributed to the
20 Committee members at this time.

21 CHAIRMAN OGLE: The other thing I would like
22 to ask is, one of the things we need, I guess, is a
23 recommendation from the Committee as to whether we concur
24 with the assessment -- condition assessment that has been
25 completed to date by MK Centennial. We had some good

1 discussion; a lot of questions were raised.

2 Barney?

3 MR. O'QUINN: My question there would be, and
4 I don't know what their contractual arrangements as far as
5 the scope of work is that's in the contract with the Park
6 Service. So I think it's going to be difficult to say
7 whether or not they've done what they've been hired to do.

8 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Well, it is confusing. At
9 the end of our last meeting, the way I understood what was
10 going to happen is, they were going to review the existing
11 reports, tell us what additional needed to be done. They
12 told us in June, in the report they sent us, that they had
13 reviewed the reports, other information may be needed, and
14 additional data may need to be collected. And so far, all
15 that's been done is review existing reports. But now we're
16 being told they think that's sufficient.

17 So I guess I think we should have a motion from
18 the group, whatever you want it to be, as to whether you
19 concur with the work they've done so far with regard to
20 condition assessment. Do you think it's adequate and
21 satisfactory?

22 MR. BABB: Can I add one thing to try to
23 answer Barney's question? In essence, what Craig -- and
24 correct me if I'm wrong -- but in essence what the contract
25 says is we initially agreed to look at a whole set of

1 documents as part of their base foundation. They looked at
2 that, and then we found there were more documents that were
3 pertinent. So we made more things available, and MK
4 reviewed them.

5 We also realized, like Craig said, there was a lot
6 of information but it was in people's notes, draft reports,
7 et cetera. So in essence, we tried to get people together,
8 and MK spent, well, a good amount of time in talking to
9 people, reading these notes, et cetera. We then, on top of
10 that, got the people together from the Park and Federal
11 Highways in their office to again go through the condition
12 assessment to talk to again who we thought knew the most
13 about the roads.

14 And I think what -- and I don't mean to put words
15 in Craig or MK's mouth. I think they're saying based on
16 that level of detail, that they're feeling there is enough
17 analysis and work done for them to continue the process and
18 go into the engineering alternatives.

19 Again, like Barney said, they're not design
20 alternatives at that level of detail. That doesn't mean
21 they might not find something a month from now that we say
22 Hey, we can't go further without this information. But I
23 think, as of now, they're saying that they feel comfortable
24 to start developing the alternatives. Is that close, or am
25 I way off?

1 MR. GASKILL: I think that's right. For the
2 level we're at, we have a lot of information than we
3 normally would to make recommendations, but we don't have
4 the detail that you have in design reports which is, that's
5 where you start drilling, doing a lot of drilling and doing
6 a lot of dessication and start spending a lot of money. We
7 don't have that level of money. That's why I wanted to make
8 sure I understood what Barney was asking. We don't have
9 that level. But we have more than we normally have for this
10 level of detail, and we're very confident that there is a
11 need out there.

12 We have a good enough understanding what that need
13 is to make recommendations at how we need to make repairs.

14 MR. BABB: And in that contract, again,
15 specifically the contract, there is no mention of
16 gathering -- what do I want to say -- any more data. And
17 that, again, was going to be based on today's meeting. If
18 there's something missing and everybody thinks that is
19 really needed, then we have to back and find the funds and
20 get that data gathered.

21 MR. O'QUINN: That's where it's difficult for
22 us to say what's needed. We've got to rely on the
23 consultant that's doing the work to say he's got sufficient
24 information. But in the memo I wrote to you, when I
25 reviewed their engineering recommendations, the first

1 paragraph -- and it started off, Randy, with "I'm a bit
2 unclear as to what the intent of the MK Centennial report.
3 As I understand it, they were to review the existing reports
4 and identify areas where additional information is needed
5 for the engineering study and develop a list of tasks which
6 should be included in the scope of work as well as cost
7 estimates for performing those tasks."

8 Now, that's -- right now, Craig's saying that they
9 have found no other tasks that need to be performed,
10 therefore, there's no cost for performing those tasks.

11 MR. GASKILL: No, I guess I should -- what we
12 did was write a recommendation that was real well received.
13 That was a recommendation that we thought needed to be done.
14 It's basically a scope of work for the upcoming work. We
15 negotiated a cost of what that will take to do that scope of
16 work, which is the rest of the engineering study.

17 CHAIRMAN OGLE: What additional -- I didn't
18 know you were talking about an additional engineering study.
19 I thought you had all the engineering study. What's the
20 engineering study?

21 MR. GASKILL: The engineering study is to
22 develop a range of alternatives.

23 CHAIRMAN OGLE: It's not data collection.

24 MR. GASKILL: And the first part of the
25 engineering study was the condition assessment which Randy

1 made the presentation. You should have in your handout a
2 field reconnaissance overview. That's a summary of what
3 Randy talked about, a little more discussion of what the
4 conditions of the roadway is.

5 MR. HYMAS: Does anyone not have that?

6 MS. HUDSON: They all do.

7 MR. HYMAS: That goes into the result of this
8 reconnaissance review. It talks about our technical finding
9 and condition assessments; the hydraulic, the temporary
10 concrete barriers, item by item. Time didn't allow us to go
11 over this in detail during the discussion period that Randy
12 was involved with, but it would behoove you probably to
13 browse through that a little bit, because it gives some
14 specifics about what we found out there in a reconnaissance
15 study and how that, then, can be used in furthering the
16 activities as spelled out on the scope of work that we're
17 working under.

18 And as far as the comments about the items we feel
19 of importance right now, we've submitted four items to the
20 Park that we feel that are very important. Of those items,
21 Craig mentioned three of them. The arch -- and the one you
22 missed, I believe, Craig, was the deterioration of the
23 roadway in the guard wall east of the East Tunnel. We tell
24 what that item is, what the problem is because of that item
25 and suggested remedies. The remedies include further

1 geotechnical studies, hydraulic studies, other studies with
2 relation to safety. So that's one of the other items that
3 we've been working on. And that may help a little bit on
4 this discussion.

5 CHAIRMAN OGLE: All right.

6 MR. BROOKE: So the document he's talking
7 about, they don't have. We've got something else, just for
8 the record. So you understand.

9 MR. O'QUINN: See, that's what I was looking
10 for. If you're making recommendations for additional
11 geotechnical studies or drainage studies or any other kind
12 of study, I haven't heard it. All I've got is the condition
13 of the road. But why is the condition there? And it's
14 either one of two things. Either you know what the problem
15 is and you can tell us or two, you need to do additional
16 studies to find out what's causing the problem before you
17 fix the problem, before you make a recommendation for a fix.
18 And that's the part that's missing, so far as I'm concerned
19 and my question earlier.

20 If you think you've got enough information to tell
21 me not only that you've got a problem but what caused the
22 problem, then we can move forward. But if you can't answer
23 that question, somebody's going to need to do some
24 additional studies to find out what's causing the problem
25 before we go making recommendations on how to fix it.

1 MR. HYMAS: That's exactly right.

2 MR. O'QUINN: And that's what we don't have.

3 MR. HYMAS: As far as the problem, we can
4 identify the problem. And as far as telling you what's
5 causing that problem, we may be able to, as any layperson
6 may be able to say Hey, there's a whole bunch of water
7 coming down, it's impinging against the field and it's
8 pushing it out and that's causing the problem. Or it may
9 take additional geotechnical studies, hydraulic studies, or
10 things of this nature, which we can identify. But we're not
11 prepared to make those additional studies as part of this
12 scope of work. We could say, in general, This is what's
13 happening. Further studies may be needed at such and such
14 point or this.

15 MR. O'QUINN: That's what I've been asking
16 for the last half hour is, are you making those
17 recommendations?

18 MR. HYMAS: We will be. We're not prepared
19 to make them right now because we just barely finished the
20 reconnaissance work out in the field, one of the steps in
21 this entire scope of work. But as an end result in June, we
22 plan to come up with solutions -- or well, that's probably
23 not the right word; recommendations. The recommendation may
24 be further geotechnical studies are required or necessary to
25 come up with an answer. But yes, we have the information

1 that we've just gleaned.

2 MR. O'QUINN: I understand.

3 MR. HYMAS: And we've gone into a workshop in
4 our office in Denver that's got this many pages of flip
5 charts, on and on and on and on, about some of our findings.
6 That was just conducted a week ago. So we're right now in
7 the early stages of putting this information together and
8 working towards the goals that you see that you need; yes.

9 CHAIRMAN OGLE: So this document you're
10 talking about is this field reconnaissance overview?

11 MR. BROOKE: No, they're two different
12 documents.

13 MR. GASKILL: There's this field
14 reconnaissance overview that everyone should have, and
15 apparently I think Will has a separate one that's --

16 MR. BROOKE: I got inside information, yeah.

17 CHAIRMAN OGLE: This refers to a complete
18 hydraulic study being needed to determine corrective
19 actions.

20 MS. PAHL: For the Divide Creek, one of the
21 four areas.

22 MR. HYMAS: Sure. We're not going to be able
23 to give you the complete design of the Divide Creek problem
24 without having a geotech or hydraulic study of that pier,
25 which we are not prepared to perform at this time.

1 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Will that be performed
2 between now and a year from now?

3 MR. HYMAS: Not by us. We've identified the
4 problem, but we are not prepared to do that geotech study or
5 that hydraulic study. But we are alerting the Park Service
6 that that would be needed in that area. The problem there
7 is so significant that we can't, as of just a cursory
8 overview, come up with the solutions required for that.

9 MS. PAHL: I think we're back on track.

10 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Now, what's the Committee's
11 feelings as to the condition assessment of MK Centennial?
12 Can somebody make a motion, one way or another, as to
13 whether we approve it or recommend to the Park Service to
14 approve it?

15 Craig?

16 MR. GASKILL: I guess what I'm looking for
17 is, does everyone agree that we've identified that there's a
18 condition on the road that is, I guess, identified as a
19 problem, shows that something needs to be done? That's what
20 we're looking for, a concurrence on -- that you agree that
21 there is something wrong with the road, that Federal Highway
22 Administration identified something wrong with the road. We
23 went up there, we confirmed that, we identified what our
24 findings were. We went on a tour of the road today.

25 I think you saw that there are some problems out

1 there. What we're trying to confirm is that yes, there is a
2 problem with the road. Once you determine that there's a
3 problem, a need to fix the road, then we can go forward and
4 determine that that's how to fix it. But if you don't
5 determine that there's a problem that needs to be fixed,
6 then we're not going to move off this step.

7 The actual condition assessment itself, this is
8 just a summary. You don't have the full report. That's not
9 complete yet. We've just had the meeting two weeks ago;
10 we're still working on that. So we'll have that report that
11 talks about the specific recommendation that I talked about
12 at the initial beginning. But what's the condition? Do you
13 agree that there's a problem?

14 MR. O'QUINN: Randy, I think it's premature,
15 until we get that report, to say whether it meets the needs
16 of -- whether they fulfilled their contract responsibilities
17 to the Park Service, is one question.

18 The second question, I think the question we need
19 to answer, is have they provided the information we need to
20 feel comfortable to move forward with it. And that part, I
21 don't think we have yet.

22 Now, they may have fulfilled their contractual
23 responsibilities to the Park Service in every item on it.
24 But is that sufficient to move forward with recommendations
25 from the Committee's standpoint? And I haven't seen those

1 answers.

2 CHAIRMAN OGLE: All right; any other
3 comments, thoughts, on Barney's assessment of the situation?

4 MR. BAKER: From a technical side, there may
5 be some deficiencies at the present moment, you know. Of
6 course there's probably going to be need for further
7 studies. But I'm fairly confident that what I have seen and
8 what has been presented to me that there is problems on the
9 road; you know. When it comes right down to the step A, I
10 think there is problems on the road. Exactly to what
11 magnitude there is, without further study, I'm not quite
12 sure of. But I think definitely for step A, yes, there's
13 problems and they need to be addressed. We may get to
14 certain options or recommendations which may lead us off on
15 one path. And at that point in time, additional studies
16 will confirm that we need to make a recommendation.

17 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I'm sure there's no doubt,
18 I'm sure, we have a consensus there's a problem with the
19 road. They knew there was a problem with the road before we
20 had a first recommendation or a Committee or an
21 MK Centennial or anything else. So I guess if that's what
22 you're looking for, I'm sure there's no question about that.

23 I think there is serious question on the part of
24 the Committee, from what I've heard, as to whether the
25 condition assessments are -- have been thorough enough, to

1 date, to be able to address the source of the problems that
2 create the deficiencies and, therefore, go to the next step
3 of trying to come up with the next step of trying to address
4 the problems. That's what it sounds to me, from what people
5 on the Committee have said so far. And it seems to me that
6 that's what --

7 MR. O'QUINN: And that may well go beyond the
8 scope of their work. It may go beyond what they've been
9 asked to do at this point. That's not the point of
10 discussion.

11 MR. HYMAS: Randy, may I make a point,
12 please? In fact, Will, I think, brought it up a few minutes
13 ago when I was talking with him during the break. This is
14 quite an involved scope of work, but it's not over. It's
15 just the beginning, as far as we just conducted the field
16 reconnaissance view a couple of weeks ago. We conducted our
17 preliminary workshop last week. Now we're putting the
18 information together from that. So we're building steps on
19 this block towards the result, the end result, which is due,
20 I believe, June the 29th. And bit by bit, we will keep the
21 Citizens Advisory Committee advised of our steps as they go
22 along the way.

23 Will said Well, we'll be looking for some
24 innovative ideas that we're concerned with. Yes, we
25 definitely believe in innovative ideas. We have a section

1 in my book here entitled Innovative Ideas. And that's going
2 to be part of our recommendations when we get to the June
3 29th date. This coming up is an innovative idea. We'll
4 research for those ideas.

5 Part of our research will go to foreign waters, I
6 believe, if necessary. I believe we have someone from
7 Switzerland as one of our advisors on our committee, our
8 consultants, and other experts to help us with those ideas.
9 We're not limited to there. We go to states and every place
10 else. So we're planning to have a thorough review and a
11 thorough accomplishment according to the scope of work we're
12 working under.

13 And I appreciate Barney's remarks. I really do,
14 Barney. It may indeed be that the Citizens Advisory
15 Committee is looking for something more detailed, more
16 involved, more core-drilling oriented than what the scope of
17 work we're currently working under will accomplish. If that
18 be the case, then that may be step two of the overall
19 scenario that we're working under.

20 MR. O'QUINN: I didn't necessarily expect the
21 core drilling be a part of this study, but the
22 recommendations for it would be, whether you did it or
23 somebody else did it.

24 MR. HYMAS: I believe we would be prepared to
25 recommend further studies on certain areas.

1 MR. O'QUINN: Prebreak, that was not what I
2 was understanding.

3 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Well, if another thing we are
4 very mindful of is the fact that the duration of this study
5 is pretty abbreviated. We're planning to finish our work in
6 June. We're now going into the winter months, and the road
7 won't be open much before we finish our task, if we get it
8 done on time. So the time for any more studies, I don't
9 know where it would come from. So, you know, if you're
10 planning on doing more studies or recommending more studies,
11 and how you're going to fit it into this thing, I can't
12 quite figure it out. But I think you do understand what the
13 Committee's thoughts are. And, really, we don't -- I don't
14 think anybody in the Committee is interested in looking over
15 your shoulders or trying to tell you how to do your job. My
16 concern is that you are comfortable enough that you have the
17 information to make the recommendations, when the time
18 comes, on how to get this road rehabilitated. And if you're
19 comfortable with the information, that's fine.

20 MR. HYMAS: I echo Craig's comments a hundred
21 percent. We spent a full week on recon out there, and we
22 worked long hours. We were up there from daybreak and got
23 in at nine o'clock at night a couple times. I've got over
24 three hours of videotapes of the road, various conditions,
25 not only driving the road but zeroing in, zooming in, even

1 night vision. Everything else on various aspects of that
2 road. And I have those to fall back on. We've got the
3 other reports that Craig mentioned. We have the experts'
4 advice of not only Federal Highway Administration, who I'm
5 sure that you are asking us to review carefully with others,
6 and we'll be putting all this information together. And I
7 feel that we've got the information necessary to comply with
8 the scope of work that we're working under.

9 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Craig.

10 MR. GASKILL: I think I might be able to
11 maybe address Barney's concern that makes these
12 recommendations on what needs to be done. And a lot of
13 stuff does need to be done in order to determine before we
14 reconstruct this stuff. I think it would be an easy task
15 for us to identify what those things have to be done before
16 we go the next step as part of this study. We didn't
17 present it today, and I'm not sure we have all the
18 information presented today. But we could easily provide
19 you with a list of -- in order to determine that the exact
20 cause of the problem which is one of these segments, then
21 even though we have a pretty good idea, we have to do the
22 following list of items, boom, boom, boom. I think that
23 would be a pretty simple thing to do.

24 MR. O'QUINN: If that's going to be in your
25 report, that's what I'm looking for.

1 MR. GASKILL: I think that would be an easy
2 thing to do, no order to get the design. So we could
3 certainly do that.

4 MR. BAKER: I think maybe we could add --
5 possibly add one word to this, and it would be "preliminary"
6 technical findings and condition assessments. I mean, we're
7 not -- I don't think this is the final one. We
8 definitely -- what you're presenting is your preliminary
9 technical findings and condition assessments. You may want
10 to add that.

11 MR. GASKILL: We will.

12 MR. HYMAS: Yeah, that's what it is.

13 MR. BABB: I heard one other thing that the
14 Committee said that was important was to make sure that --
15 this is my paraphrasing -- that we have enough information
16 to define the purpose and needs section for the
17 environmental impact statement.

18 MR. O'QUINN: Absolutely.

19 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Is there anything else that
20 we need to comment or ask questions of any of these
21 gentlemen?

22 If not, why don't we move ahead to the project
23 status report from Fred.

24 --o0o--

25 Mr. Jackson requests that Mr. Babb explain the

1 scope of work.

2 Mr. Babb explains, in essence, the one scope in
3 regards to the cultural landscape study has been broken into
4 two phases. The first phase deals with inventory. After
5 that, MK is going to come together with a series of
6 recommendations that can then be folded into the
7 environmental impact statement and analyze those
8 alternatives.

9 The other studies, the engineering and visitor use
10 and socioeconomic, there are specific scopes on what goes
11 into each one of those and the level of details and types,
12 in terms of what the drawings look like and those types of
13 things. The draft is due April 6th with the finalized
14 report due June 29th. They're pretty specific in regards to
15 what the Park is asking for.

16 Mr. Jackson asks if there is much drift from the
17 recommendation the Committee made in the first meeting. Mr.
18 Babb answers there is not. He explains how he and Mr.
19 Gaskill both worked with the letter the Committee wrote, as
20 well as the minutes notes and the transcript, as well the
21 project agreement and folded them all in. And, in fact,
22 you'll notice on the one task order, which is the
23 socioeconomics/transportation, Mr. Babb almost verbatimized
24 the letter. As well, he took the specific sections of the
25 project agreement and folded them into the project into the

1 task order. And then there were added a few things that
2 wasn't discussed some specificity. Mr. Jackson notes the
3 cultural aspect, stating he didn't think that was talked
4 about at all, but thinks it's a good idea.

5 Mr. Babb then continues on with regard to the
6 project schedule, using easel charts. He starts by going
7 through this fiscal year and then up through October of next
8 year.

9 He explains the difference between the calendar
10 years 2000 and 2001. Included in 2000 is findings and
11 recommendations, which originally was stated to be
12 September. The Committee has those, at least preliminary
13 findings, as of September. The conceptual alternatives, the
14 real rough framework to work with, MK Centennial is
15 scheduled to talk about them in September. That's what all
16 the engineering study will be based on. They're general,
17 but it is a starting point; September.

18 Where everyone is at now is the September meeting.
19 The next meeting is scheduled for May.

20 Under public scoping, a notice of intent has been
21 sent out. There haven't been any public meetings yet. They
22 are planned for either the end of October or beginning of
23 November. They should be completed by the middle of
24 November.

25 The red items are the items that are in the

1 schedule that currently have no funding. Those include
2 begin draft EIS. That was hoped to be started in October.
3 The Park is still hoping to do that in October, but there is
4 no funding to do any type of environmental document. There
5 is no money in pocket.

6 Proceeding on into the 2001 fiscal year, the
7 draft technical studies that were planned on being completed
8 in February will now be due in April, behind by
9 approximately a month. Those technical documents are all
10 inclusive; engineering study, socioeconomic, cultural, and
11 visitor use/transportation. All four are going to come
12 together at the same time.

13 The goal is to get funding real fast, that roughly
14 in the beginning of May there would be completed a real
15 rough draft EIS, with gaps but an EIS. Currently there
16 still is no funding for that.

17 The documents would be sent out the middle of
18 April, and the Advisory Committee meeting would be moved
19 from February to May so the Committee members would have
20 sufficient time to review the technical draft documents and
21 EIS. Also, the Park wants involvement from the east side,
22 so they're looking to have the Committee meeting on the east
23 side. And the earliest facilities are available would be in
24 May.

25 Based on this time schedule, MK, pursuant their

1 contract, is going to take the comments from the Advisory
2 Committee and more or less finalize those technical studies.
3 Notice by this time there's not a lot of public involvement
4 or public participation in this process. But this is what's
5 under contract. So as of June 29th, MK would have gotten
6 all the Park Service input, they would have gotten Committee
7 recommendations and made those revisions. That's where the
8 contract ends. That's where negotiations are at.

9 Then, under an ideal scenario, there are two
10 decisions which must be made. Assuming the money is
11 acquired, the Park would like to do the EIS and have the EIS
12 corrected and finalized in July, and then gather additional
13 data over the next season. That would be like resource
14 data; any surveys that need to be done; if MK Centennial
15 came up with something structural for a certain part of the
16 road, would be done next season. This is assuming the money
17 is obtained to do the EIS, which is about 1.1 million
18 dollars. That's not a cheap price tag, and that's part of
19 the difficulty of finding the funds.

20 The proposal or suggestions related to funding are
21 going to be gone over more in detail on Tuesday with Mary
22 Riddle.

23 Mr. Babb continues with his easel charts. This
24 relates around public participation as well as the EIS. The
25 red means there's no current funding, same as the first

1 sheet. The blue is public participation on technical
2 studies without the EIS.

3 So what is being said is that when MK Centennial
4 finishes making corrections from the Park Service and the
5 Committee, the Park thinks there's real merit in going out
6 to the public and getting input in that document and then
7 doing final studies.

8 Without the EIS, if the public participation is
9 done, just on technical studies, they want to start it in
10 July. Those would be consolidated in the August time frame.
11 They want to then have another Advisory Committee in roughly
12 the September time frame, which would probably be the last
13 one, and then finalize the technical studies after getting
14 input from the Advisory Committee.

15 If the draft EIS is done first, it's basically a
16 little bit longer because of the volume of documents and the
17 length of time required for an EIS public participation.
18 And rather than finishing up in October, you would finish up
19 in March of 2002.

20 Questions are floored.

21 MR. SLITER: I hate to bring up old news or
22 old issues, but it seems like I recommended in the
23 recommendations that we made in February they were to, you
24 know, start the NEPA process and the EIS as soon as possible
25 in order to make sure that we had that behind us.

1 I look at the schedule, and a third of the
2 schedule is based on something that there's no funding for
3 yet.

4 MR. BABB: That's true.

5 MR. SLITER: At what point in time are we
6 going to -- I mean, I cannot fathom taking on the public
7 participation portion of this process before a draft EIS has
8 started to work. You know, I guess I'd ask Tony or anybody
9 else on the Committee that wants to answer, from the groups
10 that are going to take the greatest interest in this
11 project, how much analysis will they really be willing to do
12 on the technical aspects of this project prior to a draft
13 EIS or an EIS being completed? I feel like we're putting
14 the cart way before the horse here.

15 MR. JEWETT: I'm concerned also about the
16 public participation schedule.

17 MR. O'QUINN: Let me ask Fred a question.

18 Did you not tell me that you had already issued a
19 notice of intent to do a draft EIS?

20 MR. BABB: Yes.

21 MR. O'QUINN: So all of what we're doing, as
22 far as the EIS process, so we're on track; public
23 involvement in this --

24 MR. SLITER: Forgive me, Barney, but we are
25 scheduled to begin a draft EIS next month, and we don't have

1 a penny to do it with.

2 MR. O'QUINN: I understand that part. What
3 I'm saying, so far as the technical reports will be a part
4 of the draft EIS. So what is going on now will ultimately
5 be fed into that EIS, and technical reports will be a part
6 of it. Any public involvement they have with the technical
7 studies will be a part of the public involvement. But
8 you're right. Now, so far as actually starting it, that's
9 supposed to be started next month.

10 MR. SLITER: The point I want to make is I
11 don't know how the public can be expected to participate in
12 something that hasn't been -- that hasn't been started yet.
13 If we want people to react to what the environmental impacts
14 or the socioeconomic impacts of this project are going to
15 be, we ought to put something in words as to what it is they
16 need to give us input about. I mean, maybe I'm being way
17 too basic about this. But it seems fairly basic to me that
18 we ought to get the funding and make sure we have the
19 funding before we continue to proceed.

20 MR. BABB: And I don't know whether this gets
21 at the issue. It seems like we have three options. You can
22 go ahead and do the technical reports with some public
23 involvement but say the main -- they're going to be fed into
24 the EIS when we get the money. And that's when you put the
25 technical reports on the shelf and they become part of the

1 whole EIS process, other than scoping, when we get the
2 funds.

3 The second alternative is to say you only have
4 funding for the technical reports and embrace public
5 participation in those alternatives for visitor use and
6 engineering. You're right; there's not going to be any
7 information to analyze them or anything else. It's just
8 alternative formulations and what's feasible and what's not
9 feasible.

10 The third then involves what you're saying.
11 Either we assume we're getting the money and we move
12 forward, or we hold it up and try to get EIS money and don't
13 go any further. But I thought at the last meeting that we
14 sort of agreed to go forward. Even if we didn't get the
15 money, that we still wanted to complete the technical
16 documents. And that's what I thought our direction was.

17 MR. O'QUINN: That would then give us
18 something to go to the initial scoping with the public as
19 alternatives that we would -- or the Park Service would put
20 on the table as a beginning point. The public could then
21 provide other alternatives that may need to be study. But
22 that would give you something -- some background of this is
23 information that has been gleaned. This is not a
24 recommendation of solution, but a recommendation as to
25 alternatives that need to be evaluated -- further evaluated.

1 That's the way I thought we were going.

2 MR. BAKER: I agree with what you said. We
3 had agreed in this last meeting that we were going to take
4 care of all of our studies to get it right up to snuff where
5 we wanted it. Hopefully the EIS funding was going to be
6 there, but we wanted to have it all in hand so we could just
7 go right on to that next step.

8 I can't foresee anybody wanting to have any input
9 on information that isn't finished.

10 MR. BABB: And I think that's what we're
11 going to be talking about. We're, in essence, going to be
12 talking about this sheet versus stopping -- if we don't get
13 money, stopping the job right here. And that's going to be
14 the focus of discussion tomorrow afternoon.

15 MR. O'QUINN: Fred, your schedule's -- maybe
16 I'm misunderstanding them. You got correct and finalize
17 draft EIS, hopefully June or July. But over here you've got
18 draft EIS, August, September.

19 MR. BABB: This draft EIS over here, where is
20 it? Make sure I'm right now.

21 MR. JEWETT: What I think you're doing is
22 you're issuing the EIS in July. And the public
23 participation and the comment period starts then and
24 finishes after 60 days.

25 MR. BABB: Right; yes.

1 MR. O'QUINN: But you're going to have public
2 involvement in the preparation of the draft. You're going
3 to have some public meetings as a part of that.

4 MR. BABB: Yes. This is just a general list.
5 It's just a general synopsis of some of the key milestones.

6 MR. JEWETT: I wanted to talk about a
7 different section of the schedule where I feel like I'm
8 going to be pressed up to participate appropriately, if I
9 understand that right, which is that one. When MK comes out
10 with the technical studies which are April of --

11 MR. BABB: Right; April 6th.

12 MR. JEWETT: -- then we are supposed to
13 review those within 30 days, I guess.

14 MR. BABB: No. You'll actually have a
15 considerable amount of time. If this is the 6th; right and
16 the May meeting -- I believe we were looking at the week of
17 the 22nd or 23rd. So you would have about seven or eight
18 weeks, seven weeks at least in there. This will probably be
19 a little turn around. You might get this two or three days
20 later, but you'll definitely get it by the 10th. So what's
21 that? Basically three weeks there and three weeks there, so
22 you'll have about six weeks.

23 MR. JEWETT: I think that's going to be a
24 very tough period of time for people on this Committee to
25 really try to digest, timely digest, what are technical

1 reports that come out. And six weeks may be enough time,
2 but it's going to be a busy time.

3 MR. BABB: It's a lot of work.

4 MR. JEWETT: And I think that we need to talk
5 about how we're going to do that productively because I
6 think --

7 MR. BABB: And also, we're hoping that the
8 committees that you guys sort -- or the work groups that you
9 form this morning will be a help in providing an input into
10 those technical studies and sort of a networking between the
11 committees through those groups.

12 MR. JEWETT: And I had just a quick follow up
13 on that, Fred. Is each committee going to have a consultant
14 who's going to be staffing the committee?

15 MR. BABB: Yeah, we thought we talked about
16 that under your meeting agenda a little bit more about how
17 we see those actually working, and maybe discuss that a
18 little bit and get your input. I mean, we would really like
19 to get your input before we crystallize anything. And we've
20 talked a little bit with the Park Service, and I'm sure MK
21 has talked. We haven't had time to get together yet. We
22 haven't had time to do that yet on the committees.

23 MR. O'QUINN: Let me review the EIS.
24 Assuming you had the money today, you would begin the
25 draft -- formalized draft EIS in October.

1 MR. BABB: Right.

2 MS. LEWIS: The scoping.

3 MR. BABB: We're going to do the scoping no
4 matter what.

5 MR. O'QUINN: So we start in October of 2000.
6 Now, you've got complete EIS and complete draft EA and draft
7 EIS again on the other.

8 MR. BABB: What I should put in here is this
9 is for the Committee. And then this revised Committee here
10 is revisions from the Committee and NPS. Now, we have
11 something that's ready to go to press.

12 MR. O'QUINN: But anyway you plan on starting
13 it in October of this year, and the draft would be
14 circulated to the public as a formal document in November of
15 next year.

16 MR. BABB: It would go to the public in
17 September. Make sure I'm right. Go to the public in
18 September, we then consolidate those comments and we present
19 it to the Advisory board in November. And then we finalize
20 that document by January. I should have put a few more
21 words in there to explain it.

22 MR. O'QUINN: Something I don't think is
23 quite right with the process.

24 MR. BABB: Let me try. They complete a draft
25 EIS in May to go to the National Park Service and the

1 Advisory board for their input.

2 MR. O'QUINN: Right.

3 MR. BABB: Then we make corrections by the
4 end of July and we print it by the end of July; okay? Then
5 it goes to the public in the August/September time frame,
6 meaning we need 60 days minimum there; okay? Then it comes
7 back, we consolidate the comments by October.

8 MR. O'QUINN: And these are the comments that
9 you're going to address and those comments will be in the
10 final EIS.

11 MR. BABB: Right. And then we come back and
12 present that to you all and say Here's what the public said,
13 Here's our recommendations, et cetera. We have a meeting
14 with the Advisory Committee, then in November now rather
15 than October, we would make all those corrections to the
16 DEIS -- or the FEIS.

17 MR. O'QUINN: You mean the FEIS.

18 MR. BABB: This would be final and then send
19 out to the FEIS here. You're right; I should have probably
20 shouldn't have put a D, I should have put an FEIS. And
21 anybody who's worked with the environmental process knows
22 this is a pretty tight schedule.

23 MR. O'QUINN: I was going to say that's a
24 very, very, very tight schedule.

25 MR. BABB: We agree. And none of these dates

1 after here have we worked with MK Centennial on or anybody
2 else. So, you know, all those dates could slide if and when
3 we get the money anyhow or when we decide which way we're
4 going to go.

5 MR. BROOKE: What's all this discussion about
6 if and when we get the money? I mean, the reality of it is
7 there's got to be a commitment by the Park Service,
8 administratively, that they're going to fund that draft EIS
9 and a final EIS; right? Because if there isn't, we might as
10 well go home now and not waste our time and your time.
11 There's going to be commitment of funding for this, is there
12 not? We're not looking for congressional funding to do a
13 draft environmental impact statement on an administrative
14 action.

15 MR. LEWIS: The National Park Service doesn't
16 have line budget items for environmental planning and
17 environmental planning documents. They have typically come
18 through congressional appropriations in line
19 with -- typically, a line-item construction program will
20 trigger, as part of that package, the planning and the
21 environmental compliance money.

22 In this -- in the fiscal year '01 budget for the
23 first time, the Park Service had in the administration's
24 version of the budget, a two-million-dollar line-item budget
25 for compliance, service wide. A two-million-dollar pie of

1 money for more than 380 parks to try to get a piece of to do
2 their environmental compliance.

3 So the harsh reality is no, the Park Service does
4 not have line-item -- does not have, unless it's successful
5 this year, and passes in the budget will be the first time
6 that the Park Service has ever had in its operational budget
7 for environmental compliance. It typically has -- comes in
8 association with line-item construction. Does that make
9 sense, ladies, what I'm saying?

10 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Tony.

11 MR. JEWETT: Fred reminded me, I don't know
12 if we had this discussion as a part of our discussion on
13 scheduling last time. What happens if the line-item -- the
14 money comes six months after we're done with our work? Do
15 we have a discussion about whether or not -- and then the
16 EIS process would start. Did we have a discussion at our
17 last meeting about whether or not the Committee would have a
18 role as to EIS process kicks off? Or will we be done,
19 basically, at that point?

20 MS. LEWIS: Well, I'd have to go back and
21 check your legislation, but I'm pretty sure you're sunset by
22 that point. You're done with, in terms of your legislative
23 authority to act as a body. What we're trying to do is not
24 to see -- I mean, ideally, this process would track along
25 with the money you need to do an environmental impact

1 statement. I mean, that's the best of all possible worlds
2 for us to be in. But that money has not come about,
3 probably because we still don't even have an authorization
4 for the repair of the road.

5 MR. BABB: One thing, Will, your statement.
6 Even if we don't get the money, I don't think we should go
7 home because no matter what happens, we'll have gone -- I
8 mean, we'll have done a lot of stuff in regards to
9 analyzing, having feasible alternatives looking at options
10 with regards to funds to stimulate the local economy. I
11 mean, there will be a lot of ingredients for that EIS. And
12 I think the only thing you have to do is you still have to
13 be positive that even though we don't get it this October,
14 that we'll get it next October or well be get it real soon.
15 I mean, the Park Service has moved all up and down the
16 channels to try to get the money. Federal Highways has gone
17 through their channels trying to get the money. We're
18 looking for -- I don't want to say nickels and dimes, but
19 even percentages of that million dollars so we can move
20 forward. We're saying if they can give it to us over two or
21 three years and stretch the process a little bit.
22 Everybody's busting their hump trying to find that money.
23 But so far, the fact is we don't have it yet. Sorry.

24 Go ahead, Brian.

25 MR. BAKER: I was just going to -- actually,

1 you answered a lot of my questions. Was this whole issue not
2 as a direct result of the Park Management Plan issue which
3 then got bumped down to this -- to the Going-to-the-Sun
4 corridor? So when it comes to environmental impact studies
5 under Park Management Planning, do you not have a line-item
6 for management planning proceeds?

7 MS. LEWIS: No.

8 MR. BAKER: How did you fund your last Park
9 Management?

10 MS. LEWIS: They're funded by projects
11 competitively, service wide. So you compete for every park
12 that feels it needs a management plan, an update or a new
13 management plan written for a new area, will compete service
14 wide.

15 MR. BAKER: So what would happen if you're
16 within your five-year or 15-year time frame when you, by
17 law, have to do your Park Management Plan and you had no
18 money, what would you do? How would you get that money?

19 MS. LEWIS: I'd have to compete, service
20 wide, for it with every other park. And many of the
21 National Park Service sites are well outside the 10- to
22 15-year frame for having an up-to-date General Management
23 Plan. I'd say probably 40 percent of the parks are behind
24 on meeting that time schedule. It might appropriate less
25 than -- I'm guessing, wouldn't you, Fred, what, less than

1 five million dollars annually for all General Management
2 Planning in the National Park Service? Say that one more
3 time, five million dollars annually for more than 380 parks.

4 MR. BABB: And the priority for that money
5 goes to GMPs. It doesn't go to studies like that. The
6 studies that we're undertaking here, there's not sort of a
7 nice, neat pot of money that you can compete with within the
8 National Park Service for. And if you go back to park X
9 five years after the GMP or ten years after the GMP, there's
10 a good chance that we've hardly got any money or anything to
11 implement that GMP.

12 MR. BAKER: My second part of the question
13 is, the money that we got to operate this Advisory
14 Committee, that was what, a congressional appropriations?

15 MS. LEWIS: Yes.

16 MR. BAKER: Can there not be add-ons to that?

17 MR. BABB: Yes, depending on the
18 congressional process; that's correct.

19 MR. O'QUINN: But as a Committee, our
20 responsibility is solely for these two technical studies
21 that are going on, not the environmental study.

22 MR. BABB: That's correct.

23 MR. BROOKE: We recognize as a Committee that
24 if this process didn't start, it was not going to be very
25 fruitful, whereas -- or as effective, I guess. And the

1 other thing, I think, that was going on early on was --
2 correct me if I'm wrong -- but I think the Park Service,
3 that at least some people, had the belief that they didn't
4 maybe have to do an EIS on this thing because it was
5 restoration work instead of new construction or something.

6 MR. BABB: Well, I think through the GMP
7 process that we all in the Park Service realized that we had
8 to do it, and that was part of our commitment, before we
9 move forward, except with the emergency stuff, that we had
10 to do an environmental impact statement for this project.
11 Suzann can correct me if I'm wrong, but I think that's what
12 we all agreed to it, at least here in Glacier.

13 CHAIRMAN OGLE: We've got to move on here, I
14 think.

15 Did you have something quickly, Paul?

16 MR. SLITER: Well, I vividly remember
17 somebody discussing the fact that maybe an EIS wasn't going
18 to be necessary, but I don't know where exactly that came
19 from.

20 MR. BABB: I remember that too.

21 MR. SLITER: What I'm curious about is -- I
22 have this big uncomfortable feeling in my belly about what
23 we've done so far versus what we've left undone, based on
24 what needs to be done. Now, that's kind of a mishmash of
25 words, but if we go back to the beginning and say, you know,

1 This is the budget for what needs to be done in order to get
2 this road fixed because we know that it needs to be fixed
3 because our charter for the Committee says Got to fix the
4 road. So you guys need to help us put together some
5 recommendations about how to fix it.

6 And so far, all we really know for sure is that
7 there's a problem. That's what we've heard today. Now, I'm
8 not blaming MK Centennial. But what my question has got to
9 be is what is it that the Park Service has contracted with
10 MK Centennial to do over the course of the past eight months
11 to start formulating these recommendations, only to come
12 back and tell this Committee today Yeah, there's a problem
13 up there on the hill. That -- you know, that's what I'm
14 hearing, is that I hope that the money that could have been
15 used for beginning the EIS process hasn't been, you know,
16 trickled down the culvert up here in the form of formulating
17 some sort of an opinion that we already knew was true.

18 MR. BABB: I can answer part of that, I
19 think, anyhow. In essence we -- and you correct me, Craig
20 or Suzann, if I'm wrong. That in essence we set one
21 contract up for participating at meetings which, if I
22 remember, is about \$30,000. We set another contract
23 for -- was it \$92,000 something like that, to go through
24 what I'll call it the literature and the investigation and
25 talking to people on the condition of the road. We then let

1 another contract for -- God, I can't remember the exact
2 amount. This includes the transportation aspect of it. Was
3 that 700-

4 MR. GASKILL: It was 700.

5 MR. BABB: Seven hundred thousand dollars.
6 And then we let a cultural landscape study contract for
7 about \$80,000. Don't hold me to exact dollars and cents.
8 But in terms of thousands, that's pretty much where we are.
9 Now, that money came from a pool of sources. That came from
10 cultural resource studies where we had like a hundred
11 thousand dollars. It came from transportation study where
12 we had 200-and-some thousand dollars, and it came from the
13 EMR study -- the earmarked money, which I think we had a
14 million dollars or just slightly under a million dollars.
15 So that's the contract that we had signed to so far.

16 The majority of the money is for the actual
17 studies themselves or technical studies, the engineering
18 alternatives and that study, the socioeconomic analysis and
19 the cultural landscape and the visitor use/transportation.
20 Probably three -- no, probably more than that. Probably
21 over three-quarters of the money went towards those efforts.

22 MR. SLITER: I don't want to take up anymore
23 time with this. But it just seems like, you know,
24 we're -- we're going ready, set, urch here.

25 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I don't mean to cut off Paul,

1 we're way behind schedule, and it's the same topic that
2 we've been talking about all afternoon. And we'll probably
3 hear more about it during the rest of our sessions. Are we
4 ready to go ahead?

5 Thanks, Fred.

6 I'm concerned we're late. We do have a public
7 comment period at 5:00, so we want to be prepared to do
8 that. So, Craig, you have a transportation/visitor use
9 study report for us?

10 --o0o--

11 Craig Gaskill gave a summary of the transportation
12 use study. It's written up in the project agreement as
13 doing a transportation visitor use study that would help
14 identify the best alternatives for the rehabilitation of the
15 road. So that when the Committee looks at alternatives,
16 they understand what the transportation and visitor issues
17 are.

18 And everyone who stopped at Logan Pass recognized
19 there's a lot of congestion at Logan Pass. The study wants
20 to look at, if they're going to do some different
21 rehabilitation alternatives, how is that going to affect
22 visitor use and the transportation.

23 The first thing looked at is to identify what the
24 current conditions are. That's the first part of the study.
25 MK has done a lot of work on that. There's a lot more

1 information out there than they normally have to start a
2 study about. So MK feels pretty good about the
3 documentation out there. They have a visitor use survey.

4 The next step is to determine the visitor
5 expectations and the future travel demand. They have to
6 know what's going to happen in the future. That's the part
7 they're working on right now, and MK can use some of the
8 input which will be discussed Tuesday morning to get some
9 input on that; what that visitor use should be and how you
10 measure that.

11 Once that is determined and how it should be
12 measured and what the visitor experience should be in
13 Glacier National Park, then a plan should be developed to
14 manage that visitor experience. They need to understand how
15 the transportation system is going to work, whether it
16 includes a managed transit system for example, whether they
17 have transportation staging areas and try to encourage
18 people to ride the transit system, whether it's a bus system
19 or something else as an alternative to driving the vehicles.
20 Not necessarily as a replacement but as an alternative to
21 give more mobile choices when in the Park. Or whether there
22 are different visitor experiences that can be expanded upon
23 to try to address some of the conditions that are out there
24 right now. If there's too much use at Logan Pass, and you
25 don't want to put more people up there, are there better

1 ways to manage the visitor use up there? MK doesn't know
2 the local conditions as well as the Committee members.

3 One of the key parts of developing alternatives
4 that tie with the engineering alternatives so they can come
5 up with recommendation, is that they accommodate and are
6 tied together with the economic issues. What they've
7 collected is the existing information.

8 A question that came up at Logan Pass was, do they
9 know how much of the traffic is through traffic, actually
10 stopping at Logan Pass and continuing on? MK wasn't able to
11 get that information from anything that was reviewed. It
12 turns out that based on the survey that's been done, and
13 looking to the data that has been done, MK can collect that
14 information. MK is planning on providing that type of
15 information and providing long-term and short-term
16 provisions.

17 Jean Townsend then gives her presentation relating
18 to the socioeconomic study. She mentions the Committee
19 members have socioeconomic discussion sheets at their
20 station. She goes over the topics briefly and then
21 summarizes the topics.

22 She checks on the scope of work, to make sure that
23 everybody knows what it says and what it doesn't say,
24 reviews the visitor survey instrument and shares why it was
25 done. She reviewed the results of a meeting, two meetings

1 that were held just last Friday with the local economic and
2 tourism development specialist. She mentions the handout
3 the Committee has.

4 And she discusses some of the Committee's policy
5 advice regarding potential federal funds that might be
6 gotten to mitigate. She wants guiding principles regarding
7 that. There are Citizen Advisory Committee outcomes and
8 questions.

9 The advice that Jean wants is in response to these
10 questions: Regarding the scope of work, she wants to talk
11 about the emphasis on mitigation strategies versus
12 quantifying the socioeconomic impact. She wants to know if
13 the Committee is comfortable with it. She wants advice
14 defining the "local area." Different from the pieces of
15 work that have been done before, MK has a definition of what
16 is meant by the "local area." She wants additional
17 brainstorming ideas on what types of mitigation strategies
18 might be started to be researched, and then get the guidance
19 on use of potential federal funds for mitigation.

20 Going back to the scope of work, the Committee was
21 given a three-page socioeconomic scope of work. She
22 mentions the main feature of the abbreviated scope of work.
23 Based on the Committee input in March, Tony Jewett's input
24 in particular, what was done is MK reduced the focus on
25 literally quantifying the socioeconomic effects in dollars.

1 MK is going to save that piece of work for the EIS. And
2 whoever does that EIS is going to save that more technical
3 piece of work on the direct and indirect socioeconomic
4 effect.

5 There is an assumption that there might be a
6 negative impact due to the road reconstruction. And given
7 that working assumption, MK is spending their effort on the
8 mitigation strategy. They are fast forwarding to the
9 solutions and going to be spending a lot of time focused on
10 mitigation in lieu of doing the mitigation plus the more
11 technical quantification. And the more technical piece of
12 work, again, is not that it won't be done, it will be funded
13 separately when the EIS is done. That's the major change
14 from last March, which is significant. And Ms. Townsend
15 thinks it is a good expenditure of limited resources, but
16 wants the Committee's input as to whether they agree or not.

17 The other aspect regarding the scope of work that
18 again is asked by Ms. Townsend is MK has defined the local
19 area as a three-county area; Lake County, Flathead County
20 and Glacier County, along with a portion of Alberta. That's
21 not to say that the socioeconomic impact doesn't go beyond
22 those three counties. That is silly, and not what is meant.
23 But MK wants to take a closer look at the local economy, so
24 they needed to define what was meant. It's easier if it can
25 be defined as whole counties. Whole counties are in or

1 whole counties are out. So she wants the Committee advice
2 on that too.

3 The visitor survey was a large part of the piece
4 of work. It was distributed towards the end of August by
5 Park Service staff; Fred and Dayna. There was about a
6 thousand responses back so far and she hopes to have more.
7 The reason why the survey was done was, although there's a
8 number of other surveys that have been done, a lot of them
9 had to do with the quality of the visitor experience in the
10 Park; How did you feel about this? Did you enjoy this? Did
11 you enjoy that? Some of those questions were asked in this
12 survey, but more was asked like How did you get here? What
13 cities did you visit? How much money did you spend? More
14 demographic questions were asked of the visitor. And more
15 specifically asked was the question did they drive
16 completely over the pass or just partway and return. The
17 survey results should be completed the end of October, first
18 part of November. A lot of very specific cross-tabulations
19 can be done from this survey: If wanted, those over seventy
20 years old, what they liked to do; of the Montana residents
21 only, what was their experience, why did they come.

22 Another piece of work that has just been started
23 is the mitigation strategy piece. MK has been working on
24 the socioeconomic mitigation ideas from the beginning. Two
25 meetings have been held, one on the east side of the Park

1 and one on the west side of the Park. And those invited to
2 the meetings are people who are directors of or on the
3 boards of economic development organizations. So sort of
4 the local economic development or tourism develop
5 specialists, if you would, in the area.

6 The quality of the remarks was exciting,
7 outstanding, wonderful thinking on the part of the
8 participants. Participation was low, but the quality was
9 excellent. In front of the Committee members is the agenda
10 and the folks invited and the handout to the participants
11 regarding the schedule just for the mitigation plan and the
12 results of the brainstorming efforts from the east side and
13 the west side. One of the biggest questions asked of the
14 participants is Imagine it's the year 2005 and the road
15 reconstruction has gone on for several years. At the same
16 time, the local economy's never been better. In fact, it's
17 just as you imagined it would be. And your best friend's in
18 town and you want to tell your best friend all about it;
19 everything that happened that you are so proud of. And so
20 what you see here in the results is people's remarks as to
21 what they were so pleased about that had happened. This
22 forms the foundation of the types of ideas that MK will now
23 pursue.

24 This was the first of three meetings with the
25 local economic development or tourism group of people.

1 There will be another meeting which they have advised MK
2 should perhaps be coincidental with the governor's
3 conference on tourism, perhaps a half day before that
4 meeting, which is in March. MK will come back with feedback
5 from that. And then there will be a third meeting before
6 the next Advisory Committee meeting planned.

7 Ms. Townsend asks the Committee members a question
8 to answer tomorrow. There is legislation going through
9 Congress. And if one of these bills goes through, indeed,
10 there will be money not only to fund the road improvements
11 but also to fund the mitigation plan. And what would be
12 extremely helpful to MK's efforts is if the Advisory
13 Committee could give MK some advice regarding some guiding
14 principles as to how the Committee would like to see that
15 money spent. Not literally on what activities but, for
16 example, how should the funds be leveraged? That's a
17 thought. Should they be phased expenditure of funds? What
18 types of organizations should be eligible to receive these
19 funds? Is it businesses, is it only private nonprofits? Is
20 the money distributed through chambers of commerce? What
21 about the governance of funds? The funds might be
22 substantial. How should they be, literally, doled out? Who
23 should be responsible for the efficiency and effectiveness
24 of spending these funds? So sort of some big picture
25 guiding principles would really help MK as they're preparing

1 this.

2 Questions are floored.

3 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Questions for Jean? The real
4 serious input or questions with regard to doling out dough
5 and that type of thing she was talking about, maybe we can
6 save for the work group. Because I don't think we have
7 enough time to get into that now. But other questions or
8 comments we have for Jean on socioeconomic?

9 Will.

10 MR. BROOKE: Jean, I didn't quite understand
11 what you were doing with that question when you asked and
12 got the responses on the best friend comes to town scenario.
13 What do you do with those answers then?

14 MS. TOWNSEND: The reason for the question
15 was to understand what sort of mitigation strategies, ideas,
16 directions the local community would like us to research.
17 And so -- and it's more fun to phrase it in the positive.
18 You know, tell me what happened that's good. Tell me -- and
19 so the reason for the question was to get from the local
20 community, and indeed we did, a number of different
21 mitigation strategy ideas. That's what they mean to me.

22 For example, there was a strong message to extend
23 the tourist season into the two shoulders, into the spring
24 and into the fall. As a matter of fact, there were some
25 specific ideas on how that might be done. That's the kind

1 of feedback I need when my staff and I go back and research
2 more specifically. Okay; well, if that's the goal, how do
3 we suggest we do that? So it basically -- it's not the only
4 tool, but it's a very valuable tool to give me sort of
5 marching orders as to what sort of ideas to look into. That
6 was the reason.

7 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Other questions for Jean.
8 Linda.

9 MS. ANDERSON: This isn't a question. I
10 guess it's more of a comment. And Jean talked about it on
11 the phone. Is that we were a little concerned at the time
12 of year the survey was done. It was done at the end of
13 August. Visitors were down. The fires were blazing around
14 the state. And maybe you can address that, as to what kind
15 of response there was and was it still a good thing to go
16 ahead and do that at that time.

17 MS. TOWNSEND: Well, several people have
18 asked the question that Linda just asked. And from the time
19 we received the signal to go with the survey, we scrambled
20 as hard and as fast as we could to prepare the survey and
21 get it reviewed by the DC office, the National Park Service
22 and OMB and get it in the field. And the fastest we could
23 physically do it was the last week in August. And a few
24 miracles had to happen to make it that quick. And a few
25 miracles did happen, and we were able, at least, to get it

1 in the field the last week in August.

2 That said, Mother Nature wasn't real cooperative
3 in August. And really, the day the survey was about to be
4 distributed, the Park Service made a very serious sort of
5 gut call. We had two choices. Do we go in the field now,
6 knowing it isn't perfect because of the fires, et cetera, or
7 do we not go in the field and do all of our work in absence
8 of the survey research? Those were the only two choices on
9 our plate. And we decided to go in the field and do the
10 survey, and these are the results the best that we can.

11 We will compare the demographics of that survey
12 with others to test whether the results are similar or
13 dissimilar or how similar or dissimilar they are. So we'll
14 have some benchmarking that we'll be able to do. And we
15 purposely asked some questions that were identical to prior
16 surveys so we can see if the answers are similar or
17 dissimilar. But it was the best we could do under the
18 circumstances.

19 CHAIRMAN OGLE: How many surveys did you
20 distribute?

21 MS. TOWNSEND: We distributed 3,077.

22 MS. LEWIS: And you've gotten a thousand back
23 already, which is a 33-percent return, which is huge.

24 MS. TOWNSEND: Hope for more.

25 MS. HUDSON: I just wanted to say when we

1 handed the surveys out, we had two different groups. We had
2 8:00 to 12:00 and 12:00 to 4:00. And the morning half -- we
3 split the surveys up so we had to make sure that each shift
4 had surveys, that way we could give them all out by ten
5 o'clock. We had many, many people during the day that
6 didn't get a survey. There were so many people in the Park,
7 even though there was smoke. And most of them were not from
8 Montana. So we did hit a lot of visitors.

9 MS. LEWIS: I was going to say I handed out
10 surveys at the entrance station, and like 95 percent of the
11 people I contacted were out of state. And possibly, of that
12 small percentage, at least half of that other small
13 percentage had people in their car from out of town, even
14 though they might have been --

15 MS. KREMENIK: Were they handed out equally
16 on the east and west side of the Park?

17 MS. TOWNSEND: No. Proportionately, based on
18 history of how many people entered at the east end and
19 entered at west. Same by the day of the week. So there
20 were more handed out on Saturday and Sunday than on a
21 Tuesday, for example.

22 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Barb.

23 MS. PAHL: The National Trust has been doing
24 Heritage Choice for about ten years and has been starting to
25 gather data quarterly about visitors. I should just

1 encourage the Park Service, this shouldn't be the only time
2 that the Park Service should be doing visitor surveys.
3 Because at the peak of the season, a lot of schools, as you
4 know, are in the end of summer.

5 I looked at the survey quickly. I think it should
6 be done regularly, not just for this project, and in all
7 other parks.

8 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Other questions for Jean.
9 David.

10 MR. JACKSON: Actually, Jean can help, but I
11 have the July 20th draft scoping. And the socioeconomic
12 thing was real close to what the Committee recommended. And
13 then somewhere in between there and now, there was a shift
14 to study mitigation instead of the socioeconomic impacts.
15 And I'd like to know what the rationale was.

16 MS. TOWNSEND: I can answer that one real
17 easy. Budget. Budget. Budget. We collectively needed to find ways
18 to reduce the budget. And since the EIS was hopefully
19 coming on stream, there was an opportunity to fund a piece
20 of the socioeconomic impact another way.

21 MR. JACKSON: Could I ask one other question?
22 These questions you've asked about the continued behavior of
23 visitors which, you know, where they go thinking they're
24 going to wait or whether they had to pay and stuff, I don't
25 imagine will reflect the responses of visitors in July or

1 most of August because of the earlier studies suggest that
2 there's differences in visitor size and visitor
3 transportation, where they stayed. Do you have a rationale
4 or a way of taking these results and then integrating them
5 with the earlier stuff, rather than comparing them? I mean,
6 you know, you're going to find out they're going to be
7 different. So what do you do then? You've got a half a
8 month's visits from the -- not even a half a month's visits
9 from the prime visitor season, and you won't have a way,
10 unless you think it through, of how to make it useful. And
11 that's -- aside from the fires and everything, you've got a
12 tiny sample of visitors at Glacier Park this year, in terms
13 of the nature of the variation and all that stuff.

14 MS. TOWNSEND: I guess I can answer it
15 several different ways. First of all, a number of the
16 questions in this survey have never been asked before. So
17 good or bad, you know, we don't have a prior benchmark. And
18 in fact, that was one of the reasons why we did this survey
19 as opposed to just relying on prior surveys is, we wanted
20 information that wasn't available.

21 So that other facet in answering your question is
22 if it is desired -- if it is desired, this same survey
23 instrument can be redistributed next June or July with very
24 little additional permission from the feds. We may
25 redistribute it and that might be -- that is the perfect

1 test. It won't be in time for you to deliberate and decide
2 things but, nevertheless, that would be a perfect thing to
3 do.

4 And then the third thing, to the extent that we
5 have questions in the prior surveys that ask very similar
6 things, we will observe the two. And maybe they're similar
7 and maybe they're dissimilar. We'll just close it and we'll
8 deal with it or we'll work with it.

9 MR. JACKSON: Well, I think it's smart to
10 continue into next year, particularly if there's an EIS, so
11 that it's useful in the EIS. But I think a preliminary
12 thing you could do is you could take some weights off of
13 other studies and apply the weights to the results of this
14 study so you're really --

15 MS. TOWNSEND: We could do that.

16 MR. JACKSON: -- really come up with a system
17 of a better reflection of the nature of what you might think
18 would change with closing the road and having it one way or
19 whatever the question is. That's one thoughtful thing I
20 think to try and think through which is important.

21 And then I also have to advise you, you're not
22 going to have much to go on from this, the socioeconomic
23 impact assessment. Maybe you're going to get it all out of
24 the EIS, but it's still going to cost a lot of money.
25 Sounds like the cultural is going to suck the budget.

1 MR. BABB: No, the cultural is separate
2 funding.

3 CHAIRMAN OGLE: We need to go on to our
4 public participation.

5 You have one short question, Will?

6 MR. BROOKE: I do. I have one observation.
7 I'm a little bit surprised on the question 41 says, Do you
8 like sex? I'm just surprised. Anyway, the question 20 -- I
9 just was kidding you.

10 (Laughter.)

11 MR. JEWETT: Everybody grabbed their survey.

12 CHAIRMAN OGLE: All right; we'll move it to
13 our public comment.

14 MR. BROOKE: Question 26, an issue that was
15 raised, I think at our first meeting and through a lot of
16 the public participation prior to that, was the question
17 about Would you visit Glacier Park if you could still reach
18 the top if one side or the other was closed. And the
19 concern a lot of us expressed was that question answered by
20 people who were already here might be far different by those
21 people who are planning a trip. The short of it is, if you
22 said to somebody who's planning a trip out in Minnesota, If
23 I told you the Park road was going to be closed on one side
24 or the other, would you still come to Glacier or would you
25 wait until construction was finished? We've always

1 suspected that would be a much different answer.

2 And I guess my point is, is there any plan to get
3 this out to people other than the folks that are already
4 here and visiting? Because if I'm already here and I see
5 what I'm visiting, I'm more likely to say yes to that
6 question. I'd still come anyway. But if I'm out in my
7 living room in the middle of February planning a trip, I
8 don't know if I would have the same answer. And the Travel
9 Montana has an incredible data base of people who are
10 requesting information about wanting to come to Montana.
11 And it seems to me you could take that data base and mail
12 out a thousand or 3,000 to that data base and see what kind
13 of survey results you get and keep it as a separate -- some
14 type of data so you can find out what people who are
15 planning to come are saying versus people who are already
16 here.

17 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Thanks, Will. Sorry to cut
18 you off, and I'm sorry to Jean and Craig for having to
19 abbreviate these presentations. Thanks for your work. And
20 we'll get a chance to talk more about it in the study
21 sections.

22 I think we'd better move on to our public comment
23 period. And I'd like to ask, for starters, just to make
24 sure everybody gets a chance to speak, if you could try to
25 contain your comments to five minutes. And if we finish and

1 we have more time, then we can permit more people or others
2 to speak longer than that.

3 The first person on the list is Kelly Harris.

4 MR. HARRIS: My name is Kelly Harris. I'm
5 representing Skillings-Connolly Woodwork on the other side
6 of the mountain. I guess I have more of a question than
7 comment. How will this project impact the current U.S.
8 Highway 89 improvement project from Browning to Kiowa
9 Junction and then up to the Hudson Bay Divide?

10 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I don't know if anybody on
11 the Committee really is prepared to address that.

12 Anybody from the Park Service know anything about
13 that, or the Highway Administration?

14 MR. BROOKE: Randy, could I make one point
15 about that? I distinctly remember when we concluded our
16 meeting -- at the last meeting, one very specific thing that
17 we said a couple of times was we wanted to make sure there
18 was coordination between what we did here and what was done
19 on U.S. 89 so that both of these projects weren't happening
20 at the same time to give the perception that everything
21 around the Park and the Park was closed and there was
22 construction from one end to the other. And that we gave
23 specific direction to the Park Service and MK to make sure
24 that they work with and contacted 89 on this issue so that
25 didn't happen.

1 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Yeah. And also I can follow
2 up on that. I was asked by Senator Baucus to address a
3 transportation department meeting in June, which I did. And
4 the head of the department of -- Montana Department of
5 Transportation, Marvin Die was there. And I did ask Mr. Dye
6 if MDOT would provide some representation and consultation
7 to our Committee and to the Federal Highway Administration
8 to assure that we don't have conflicts in our projects going
9 on at the same time. He assured me that he had been
10 contacted, the Department of Transportation would be
11 coordinating with the Federal Highway Administration with
12 regard to the scheduling of the project.

13 So -- and I appreciate you mentioning that, Will.
14 We did discuss that at our last meeting, and we have had
15 contact with Montana Department of Transportation. And we
16 are going to be taking that into consideration to ensure we
17 don't have scheduled conflicts.

18 MR. DAKIN: I think it was a line-item in our
19 written recommendation, if I remember.

20 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Yes, it was; thanks, Bill.

21 MR. BABB: Can I add a little bit to that,
22 Mr. Chairman?

23 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Yes.

24 MR. BABB: We've been working with Wahler*
25 out of the Montana Department of Transportation. They've

1 been our contact. We've been working with them. In regards
2 to Looking Glass and the east side of 89, Brace Hayden is
3 the Park Service contact working in that area on behalf of
4 the Park. And we've been trying to work together between
5 that study and what Brace is doing as the Park contact in
6 there.

7 So we are working with them. And in essence, it's
8 going to get -- what do I want to say, more fruitful as we
9 proceed with our engineering alternatives. And as, you
10 know, they already have their real rough alternatives done.
11 So that's the time we're going to be talking. And there has
12 been discussions on funding and scheduling and those types
13 of things. But they're only discussions so far, no details
14 of working. None of the details have been worked out.

15 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Fred, can you help us a
16 little bit on how that coordination is going to take place?
17 I was under the impression that maybe they would be having
18 somebody from the department attend some of these meetings.

19 MR. BABB: We sent Danny Curette* -- we sent
20 an agenda. And last time we talked, they were going to be
21 here. I'll call tonight and see whether I can reach him and
22 find out what happened. But yes, they were supposed to be
23 there. And Barney, myself and MK were to meet together and
24 continue this dialogue and set up a schedule in regards to
25 how we're going to work over the winter, more or less, to

1 that.

2 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I recall Barney and I talked
3 about this before my meeting with the Department of
4 Transportation meeting in June. And Mr. Dye assured me that
5 they were going to have some participation in here. Maybe
6 we could also ask Anna Marie to follow up when you get home
7 and see if we couldn't get some participation from MDOT at
8 these meetings, just to ensure the coordination.

9 MR. O'QUINN: I've had two or three
10 conversations with staff members from MDOT, as well as we
11 had a conference call that I was involved with with the Park
12 Service staff and DOT staff. I think about five or six of
13 them, four or five with the Park. So they do want to be
14 involved in our -- or sounding like it, from all
15 indications, they'd like to be a joint partner in whatever
16 way they can provide for support in doing this.

17 MS. LEWIS: I think we're, frankly, surprised
18 they're not here today. It was our understanding that they
19 would have a representative here today.

20 MR. BABB: We sent an agenda and all those
21 things. We'll double-check tonight.

22 MR. O'QUINN: They thought the road was
23 closed.

24 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Does that help, Mr. Harris?

25 MR. HARRIS: Yes, it did; thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Our next person who signed
2 up is Cesar Hernandez. Did I say that right?

3 MR. HERNANDEZ: I've got a little handout
4 that I won't go through, for the sake of brevity. I would
5 just like all the members of the board to consider --

6 Just to let you know, I am the field rep for the
7 Montana Wilderness Association. And our interest here is
8 that we would like to see the impacts to the economics of
9 the area minimized, as reconstruction or rehabilitation of
10 the Going-to-the-Sun Road occurs. We'd also like to
11 minimize impacts to the wildlife and Park resource and the
12 American public.

13 I think the American public is very understanding
14 and tolerant, if they are asked to endure through a finite
15 period of inconvenience. I think that's exactly what a
16 reconstruction or rehabilitation of the Going-to-the-Sun
17 Road would be. It would be for the local economies. It
18 would be for the local -- for the people that come from
19 throughout the entire nation to see the Park as a resource.

20 So what this little paper is saying is if we can
21 go to the moon, if we can build a space station in X amount
22 of years, it seems like we could rehabilitate and recontract
23 the Going-to-the-Sun Road in a finite period, say two to
24 four years. I don't see why that should be a problem.

25 I think it would -- what some of the things here,

1 and they might be very simplistic, go in the direction of
2 addressing some of the economic impacts to this area. I
3 think that's a very big thing. I've lived in Montana for
4 twenty-eight years and I've seen unemployment in the
5 counties of -- actually two of the counties that weren't
6 mentioned in the economic study, Lincoln and Sanders County,
7 hover around 13 to 15 percent annually. And so this is a
8 big concern for this area.

9 And anyway, we think that all these things are
10 possible. I just ran this by a few people. I had a
11 colleague here who took a quick look at it today, and I'd
12 just like to mention two things here. Wherever I say
13 "reconstruction", you can substitute "rehabilitation." I'm
14 sure the whole road doesn't have to be redone all over,
15 but -- and the other part is I've been a carpenter and a
16 builder. My first love is building log cabins. So I've
17 built a lot of structures. Nothing like Going-to-the-Sun
18 Road. But I have been cantilevered on working on soffits
19 and fascia and all that sort of stuff. So when I use that
20 term in here, I think that --

21 The other thing I'd just like to say is, I've
22 passed the last year and a half with the construction
23 between Somers and Kalispell, and I've seen a lot of road
24 construction going on. And I know a lot of things are
25 possible. And I know that we can continue to have through

1 traffic on this road, if we're innovative enough, in one
2 shape or another. Not necessarily for all private traffic
3 but maybe for the bus, for a shuttle service. And so I
4 think it's possible.

5 And I guess what I'm just trying to throw out here
6 is that finite time, keep the tourists coming through here.
7 I think this Committee can accomplish some good work, so I'd
8 like to encourage you; thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Thank you very much.

10 And the next person signed up is Sharlon Willows.
11 Sharlon, would you stand up and come forward and tell us who
12 you are representing.

13 MS. WILLOWS: I'm Sharlon Willows. I am a
14 certified legal assistant in administrative law and I'm also
15 the Canyon Colleges coordinator.

16 After watching today, what I see is a need to
17 subdivide the Cat Ex and the NEPA repairs. The field review
18 reconnaissance overview states, quote, "Nearly all of the
19 walls observed were suffering from some form of
20 distress/deterioration...85 percent or more was confined to
21 the upper six to eight feet of the wall height. In general,
22 the lower parts of the retaining walls were stable and will
23 require very little corrective actions."

24 The Committee and MK stated, quote, "...much
25 damage caused because of no snowplowing maintenance

1 practices." These seem to be Cat Ex problems that possibly
2 need direct attention on necessary, immediate
3 recommendations to mitigate snowplow damage while less EIS
4 attention is directed to these matters." Possibly even in a
5 separate EA for these situations. For the Cat Ex material
6 or several decision memo even to separate out these areas.
7 Meanwhile, the EIS should focus on, quote, "the exceptions
8 that require more extensive repair." I believe these
9 locations requiring extensive work should be focused on the
10 EIS separated from these other 85 percent or more that was
11 confined to the upper six to eight feet of the wall height.

12 And the areas requiring extensive work should
13 have -- should be focused on in EIS with precise milepoint
14 indicators of where these locations are.

15 I have concerns this process is turning into a big
16 generalized, quote, "boilerplate" scenario EIS rather than
17 being specific. I think boilerplate EISs are a waste of
18 everybody's time. And what we need to do is pinpoint the
19 impacts and the areas of these impacts.

20 I see timing as being important. Which is part of
21 the NEPA. I see a lot of time being wasted here. For
22 example, areas where repointing could progress immediately
23 should be Cat Ex'd and identified. Why is an EIS needed for
24 Cat Ex maintenance such as repointing and cleaning out
25 drainage culverts?

1 I have a feeling that too much essential
2 maintenance work is getting caught up in EIS unnecessarily;
3 too much time consumed in hypothetical traffic projections
4 for the future. The Cat Ex should be separated from the
5 expensive repair sections.

6 Specifically, focus on extensive repair sections
7 with design options consistent with public involvement and
8 Section 106. I'm concerned about this idea that we're going
9 to boilerplate it and then do design options later. In
10 other words, separate the EIS and the public involvement for
11 EIS and Section 106, which is supposed to be integrated and
12 where the public involvement requirements have been
13 strengthened as of June '99.

14 On a socioeconomic, I have a real concern about
15 this idea of wasting time on extending the season into the
16 shoulders. The seasons are controlled by nature. Another
17 waste of time. Mother Nature has already set the seasons.
18 I'm a native here, and I've worked tourist seasons since
19 childhood. It's simply controlled by nature, and this fact
20 is not changed. And throwing money in that direction is
21 more waste. Thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Thank you.

23 Barney?

24 MR. O'QUINN: Fred, is not the improvements
25 and corrections to problems on all the walls pretty much

1 contained in the EA funds?

2 MR. BABB: Listing the sites we've done it
3 for the emergency sites that are listed, yes.

4 MR. O'QUINN: And the second thing with
5 regard to the maintenance clean-out, that can go on. That
6 doesn't -- that's not part of the EIS.

7 MR. BABB: Yes. Well, it's -- I'd say I
8 don't know how -- I might be searching for words. But the
9 Park's talking about on Going-to-the-Sun Road, what we can
10 do under Cat Ex in regard to emergency work and normal
11 maintenance things. And Bob Boyack and Mary Riddle, our
12 compliance coordinator, are working on that. My opinion
13 would be yes, they can go ahead on that.

14 MR. O'QUINN: Normal maintenance doesn't even
15 require Cat Ex. And some of this drainage problems we were
16 talking about, that's normal maintenance. It just needs to
17 be done.

18 MR. BABB: The clean-outs are normal
19 maintenance. It depends if you have to change historic
20 fabric or something like at. But yes, clean up, it's one of
21 funding and priorities of funding and available staff.

22 MR. O'QUINN: So a lot of what she's saying,
23 you can do.

24 MR. BABB: Yes.

25 MR. O'QUINN: And it makes sense.

1 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Any other questions or
2 comments? Those are the only three that I see here that are
3 signed up to make public comment.

4 MS. ALTAMUS: Can I just make an
5 off-the-record comment? Not off the record?

6 MR. O'QUINN: Not even off the record.

7 MS. ALTAMUS: I think you need to go back and
8 address the EIS issue. Because just for realty purposes,
9 Congress is over in about six or seven days. And we -- as
10 far as the House goes, we have no request for EIS funding.
11 So if you're looking for an appropriation, just so you know,
12 I mean it may be the Senate has something different that I'm
13 not aware of. I mean, the odds are 99 percent that you will
14 not have the EIS funding until next year. I mean, next
15 fall. And then you're sunset. I mean, you have a sunset,
16 unless you're going to extend your charter. You probably
17 will work the entire next year without an EIS, because there
18 will not be funding. Because we look at our props in March.
19 And then we deal with it in the fall, September, October.
20 So unless there's some miracle that we can attach some
21 emergency this session, which I'm telling you is like less
22 than one percent, I mean just so you know, I hate to leave
23 you with a cloud.

24 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Will you state your name and
25 who you represent for the record.

1 MS. ALTAMUS: Julie Altamus with Congressman
2 Hill's office.

3 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Do you have a question,
4 Barb?

5 MS. PAHL: Julie, I was actually going to
6 ask, the bill that is out there in the House side, the
7 Senate side for the 200 million for the road, could that not
8 include funding for the EIS?

9 MS. ALTAMUS: Well, it may. I mean, it's
10 specific to the road maintenance and to the road rehab. And
11 then there's a 20 million that's in there for the
12 infrastructure.

13 MS. PAHL: And then there was mitigation
14 money in one.

15 MS. ALTAMUS: The one I have here doesn't
16 even specify the mitigation dollars.

17 MS. PAHL: Could that bill include the money
18 for the EIS?

19 MS. ALTAMUS: Probably it's too late and it
20 has to get on the suspension calendar. Because if it
21 doesn't get on the suspension calendar, it's not going
22 through either.

23 MS. PAHL: I was on the phone earlier with
24 somebody who thought there was going to be a -- what's the
25 word?

1 MS. LEWIS: Compromise?

2 MS. PAHL: No. Additional funding.

3 MS. LEWIS: Add on?

4 MS. PAHL: Yeah. For quite a bit of money to
5 relate to some Park issues, a regular thing.

6 MR. SLITER: Supplemental?

7 MS. PAHL: Supplemental; thank you.

8 MS. ALTAMUS: I know in interior there's
9 supplemental because of the fires. But whether or not --
10 I'm not sure of what you're talking about, as far as Park
11 Service.

12 MS. PAHL: I'm wondering if that would be an
13 opportunity for EIS funding.

14 MR. O'QUINN: Julie, how prescriptive and
15 restrictive is the funding in that bill? Because this is
16 saying the work has to be done. And the precursor for doing
17 the work is the environmental study. Is that not part of
18 the work?

19 MS. ANDERSON: Well, our bill talks about
20 getting the NEPA document done, the EIS done. But our bill
21 is talking about a different requirement than what, I think,
22 you're chartered to do. So I'm not sure how much of what
23 our bill, you know, you guys could even fulfill. I mean,
24 we're talking about specific instructions, but then we're
25 also saying that the department or the Secretary is the one

1 that's going to make the determination, based on your
2 alternatives to the Park Service; the Park Service gives it
3 to the Secretary and they make a decision. But Suzann said
4 that that's not what your charter develops.

5 MR. O'QUINN: Our charter, as I understand
6 it, is simply for this study that MK Centennial is doing.

7 MS. ANDERSON: Right.

8 MR. O'QUINN: Million dollars. And that's
9 why we were tied into that. But if you've got funding for
10 the EIS as part of the overall project improvement, then the
11 Park Service would just move on with that, irrespective of
12 whether this Committee exists or not.

13 MS. ANDERSON: Correct. But it's not in it.

14 MS. LEWIS: I think a couple things, when
15 Julie talks about the bill on the House side, that's an
16 authorization and not an appropriation. Therefore, even if
17 as Julie said, if a miracle were to occur overnight and the
18 authorization were to pass out, as a total bill out of the
19 House or in the Senate, that would be no money. Because
20 there is no appropriation in the system right now for any of
21 the work or the topics that are covered in the authorization
22 bill. That so that was a big hurdle.

23 You know, I'm going an eternal optimist. I get
24 paid to be that way. And my hope is that first of all we
25 have to keep looking for the money for this EIS. And

1 whether we can get 200- or \$400,000 of it this fiscal year
2 to move us along. Fred and I have talked many times that
3 the number one thing that we have to have some money for is
4 not to miss this summer, upcoming spring and summer and fall
5 data collection season. That would really hurt us. If we
6 had no money to start out the spring with the data
7 collection, once the area opens up again and the winter has
8 passed.

9 MS. ALTAMUS: And just another comment. If
10 you guys met in February and props starts in March, I'm not
11 aware that anybody came to us. If you guys knew in February
12 that you were going to have to have money for an EIS -- I
13 mean, maybe I missed something, but nobody ever contacted
14 our office.

15 MR. BAKER: That was my question. I remember
16 when our February meeting when we were talking about the
17 EIS, that the funding was going to be immediately initiated
18 and explored.

19 MS. ALTAMUS: By your board or by --

20 MR. BAKER: By the Park Service. And then
21 you're telling me now that nothing has been requested.

22 MS. LEWIS: I think it's unlawful for the
23 Park Service to request. The Park Service requests its
24 funding through the administrative process, of which we did.
25 We're prohibited -- we can't go directly to the Congress and

1 say we need this money. We have to go through the
2 Administration, the President.

3 MS. BAKER: Would they not be aware of that?

4 MS. ALTAMUS: We didn't get a request.

5 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Did your question get
6 answered?

7 Any other public comments?

8 Sir? Stand up and state your name.

9 MR. GALLAGHER: I just have a question. I'm
10 George Gallagher. I live in Great Falls.

11 I'd like to know what is going to be the role of
12 the Federal Highway Administration in this project?

13 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Dick Gatten, here, is the
14 representative of the Federal Highway Administration.

15 Dick.

16 MR. GATTEN: Our role, up until the point in
17 time when it's determined that this independent study be
18 done with an advisory committee involved, I'm at the present
19 time providing technical support to the group. But it's
20 supposed to be an independent study and analysis. Once
21 that's completed, if the Park Service chooses to continue as
22 in the past, we would do the design and the construction.
23 But I don't know that that's a given. But the Park Service
24 makes that call on how they use us.

25 MR. GALLAGHER: And that decision hasn't been

1 made yet?

2 MR. GATTEN: I didn't hear you.

3 MR. GALLAGHER: That decision has not been
4 made yet; is that correct?

5 MR. GATTEN: I don't believe so. After this
6 study and the EIS is done, if it goes as in the past, we
7 would do design and we would have our personnel out. We'd
8 let the contract and monitor the construction. I don't know
9 that that decision has been made.

10 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I don't think it has been
11 made.

12 MR. GALLAGHER: Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Is there anyone else who
14 wishes to make public comment at this session? If not, we
15 will adjourn for the day.

16 --o0o--

17 Chairman Ogle states for all present the times the
18 public comment sessions will be held the following day, for
19 those who wish to speak.

20 Mr. O'Quinn comments that members of the Advisory
21 Committee have thought of perhaps serving past their
22 appointed term on a steering committee, should the Park
23 Service choose to use one, to assist the Park Service in
24 overview of the environmental document.

25 The meeting was then closed by Chairman Ogle at

1 5:35 p.m.

2 (Proceedings in recess from 5:35 p.m. to Tuesday,
3 September 26, 2000 at 8:00 a.m.)

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 The second day of the second meeting of the
2 Going-to-the-Sun Road Advisory Committee was called to order
3 at 8:10 a.m., September 26, 2000, by Committee Chairman
4 Randy Ogle.

5 Chairman Ogle advises everyone that Mr. Babb
6 contacted the Montana Department of Transportation office
7 and, though they expected someone from their office to be at
8 this meeting, they will have someone attend the next
9 meeting.

10 With regard to the scoping documents and initial
11 contracts, Mr. Babb advises they will be going out through
12 E-mail or Xerox either the end of this week or beginning of
13 next. He also advises the contracts with MK Centennial
14 total about \$617,000 for work during the summer.

15 Chairman Ogle explains the four work groups that
16 are going to be carrying over have a bit of disparity in the
17 numbers. Three people signed up for the engineering
18 committee, six for socioeconomic, five for transportation,
19 two for public participation. He asks if somebody would
20 switch from socioeconomic/transportation over to public
21 participation. Paul Sliter volunteers to move to public
22 participation, and Susie Burch volunteers to be on both
23 transportation and public participation.

24 Continuing on with the agenda, Chairman Ogle turns
25 the meeting over to Craig Gaskill to present the conceptual

1 engineering alternatives.

2 After yesterday, Mr. Gaskill wanted to clarify
3 where MK Centennial is on the project. The conceptual
4 alternatives won't be presented until May. Today's
5 discussion will be how the alternatives should be structured
6 and set up so they have the right information providing
7 input back to the Committee to make informed decisions.

8 What MK has done to date is gone out in the field
9 and identified what they thought were the conditions, what
10 the deficiencies were and come back and reported that and
11 have had a discussion about how they would address those
12 deficiencies in a presentable format to determine the best
13 way to fix those.

14 They came up with a lot of different ways to do it
15 and a lot of different factors. He directs the Committee
16 members to their handout. It talks about the development of
17 conceptual engineering alternatives. It shows several
18 factors to be considered. The first one is construction
19 techniques. Because a lot of people think that's what
20 engineering alternatives are, it's how you're going to
21 construct the roadway; put a cantilever or some special
22 overhead crane that comes in and constructs from up above; a
23 lot of hand labor, those types of things. And those are
24 important engineering developments as to how best to
25 construct the road. However, MK didn't think that was the

1 best way to present it in the matter of alternatives. He
2 went through other options, such as drainage options,
3 economic impact, traffic and safety, avalanche, et cetera,
4 as shown in the handout.

5 The last option on the handout is traffic
6 management. And they came to traffic management, MK felt
7 that was the one factor that is easy to understand and
8 directly affects everything that is done in terms of the
9 engineering, the socioeconomic, the transportation, and
10 visitor use. The traffic management is how long they're
11 going to delay people on the road, how long the construction
12 is going to take place, the rehabilitation is going to take
13 place. Whether they're going to close it at night, during
14 the day, one-way operation, those types of things. That's
15 easy for people to understand and also directly affects
16 everything else being done.

17 MK thinks this is the best way to present the
18 alternatives. It turns out that's the way they were
19 presented in the General Management Plan. And there are
20 some alternatives in the GMP that MK will recognize are
21 similar.

22 So MK wants to give a range of what traffic
23 management options are and get the Committee's input on
24 that. Is this the right way or wrong way?

25 On the list of range of alternatives, Mr. Gaskill

1 goes through traffic management options. One is no action.
2 There's a couple million dollars, on average, that the Park
3 gets per year for improving roads. If you spent a couple
4 million dollars a year on improving that road, that road's
5 going to fall apart. A couple million dollars isn't even
6 enough to keep the road up to speed and safe. The no-action
7 option is an option. It doesn't create any traffic impacts
8 at all until the road fails, and then basically you close
9 the road. So that is at the low end of the option.

10 Number two is the status quo. That's what was
11 seen this summer, 15-minute delays per side on each side
12 with a total of 30-minute delays. That's what the Federal
13 Highway Administration contract has now. That 30-minute
14 delay appears to be working well. That's the status quo.
15 But that's also a little higher level of funding than what
16 historically has been in the Park. The current contract is
17 three-and-a-half or four million dollars. And maybe that's
18 something that could be continued in the future; maybe not.
19 But that is what the status quo is.

20 Another alternative is a one-hour maximum delay as
21 opposed to 30-minute. One-hour is not in the General Plan.
22 It would be different. When additional time is allowed for
23 the contractor, it allows more things to be done in terms of
24 construction and allows reduction of impacts. It allows you
25 to lower the cost because you can get to more people and

1 they can more efficiently work out there. It reduces the
2 amount of time allowed needed to do construction.

3 One-way traffic is an alternative. One-way
4 traffic means you can always have one lane reserved for the
5 contractor at all times for the entire road. So a lot more
6 construction can be accomplished by the contractor, as he
7 always has access on the road. This provides a lot more
8 opportunities for the contractor in terms of what they can
9 do and reduces the amount of road construction time and
10 total cost.

11 One of the disadvantages of one-way traffic is
12 it's going to require active publicity beforehand so the
13 public know that there will only be one-way traffic. In the
14 morning it goes one direction, in the afternoon it goes
15 another direction, or alternate at an hour at a time. But
16 this decision requires a lot of public information up front
17 so they don't get surprised. Another concern with one-way
18 traffic is it restricts emergency access. If someone were
19 to get hurt or in an accident, the opportunity to get
20 emergency vehicles around that restriction up there or
21 through the construction traffic is more difficult. It is
22 not in the GMP and it does place a restriction on visitor
23 experience.

24 Another alternative is a night restriction.
25 Perhaps from 9:00 at night to 6:00 in the morning, you

1 completely close the road down to traffic. Uniformed Park
2 personnel would have to clear everybody out of the Park.
3 That does provide a pretty good window of time for a
4 contractor to get in there and do a lot of construction
5 activities that you couldn't do just in a one-hour period or
6 30-minute period. You could do some things like tearing up
7 a road and replacing a culvert or doing some milling on the
8 road surface itself.

9 There are some disadvantages with night closure.
10 They're more costly at nighttime. There are some safety
11 concerns at nighttime because of falling work. There are
12 some environmental concerns, in terms of impacts with
13 wildlife. There are certain operations that have to be done
14 during the day. If you were up on the rock wall scaling and
15 you needed good visibility, it's more difficult to do at
16 night. There's some temperature concerns. When it's chilly
17 or cold at night, you'll have more difficulty getting some
18 things accomplished. But there are things that can work
19 well at night. So there are some advantages to that.

20 Similar to the seasonal restrictions. Say after
21 Labor Day you close down the road to through traffic. There
22 are the same type of issues as night restrictions. It
23 provides a lot more time for the contractor to get the work
24 done. A lot can be done all in one season, but there are
25 some weather characteristics that might present a problem to

1 the contractor. It also impacts the visitor because you
2 don't have that early and late-season access. There are
3 certain times of year where there are certain visitor
4 activities that you don't find at other times here.
5 Although, it allows the contractor some option techniques
6 that may not be done, some construction techniques that
7 would be available to him.

8 Additionally, some of the shorter-term
9 construction zones, little bits at a time, you tend to
10 provide more opportunity for inconsistency of the work. So
11 one wall might be reconstructed one year and then the one
12 right next to it might be rebuilt the next year. And they
13 might be done by different crews, and they may not look
14 exactly the same. Where with a seasonal restriction where
15 that entire section was constructed, it might all look the
16 same and be more consistent. So there's an advantage there
17 as well.

18 The next option is a managed transit system. And
19 that generated a lot of discussion among the MK Centennial
20 group. Not closing the road, but providing transit service
21 during the construction to get people across the road. It
22 wasn't clear whether that also allowed general traffic, but
23 MK assumed it probably didn't. After talking about this,
24 from the contractor's perspective, in terms of completing
25 the road, what's affecting the contractor is the access that

1 has to be provided to the public. Whether it's a car or a
2 bus, he still has to provide that access. So if managed
3 transit system was operating and it ran at the same period
4 of time as the status quo, it doesn't really help the
5 contractor. It may have some other benefits in terms of
6 reducing some restrictions at Logan Pass or some other
7 areas, but it doesn't really provide a lot of benefit for
8 the contractor.

9 Some contractors that have been talked to have
10 indicated that at about two hours, they start getting some
11 distinct advantages in being able to get some operations
12 done. Two hours is an advantage to the contractor. But if
13 you start going over about an hour for the visitor, it's not
14 a very good experience for the visitor. So there are some
15 difficulties with making the managed transit work as just
16 one option for managing traffic. It may provide a lot of
17 opportunities in conjunction with some of the other options
18 and in conjunction with the transportation visitor use
19 opportunities, providing different choices for the visitor
20 to get around during construction time and maybe see
21 important things. But just in itself, it has some
22 difficulties because it doesn't really help the contractor
23 until you have a system that is only going up about every
24 two hours. If you had a system that ran only every two
25 hours, you're going to have a lot of major demands, a lot of

1 buses, which really raises the cost of that system. So
2 that's a disadvantage of the managed transit system. Again,
3 it would require a pretty significant public relations
4 campaign to make sure the public understood how it would
5 operate.

6 The next option was restrict one side. And that's
7 kind of closing or restricting access to one side or the
8 other during the rehabilitation. So you might restrict the
9 west side entirely until that's completely done, allow
10 access to the east side of the pass. Then you might do the
11 same thing for the east side of the pass and allow access to
12 the west side of the pass. That could be alternating, a
13 couple months each side. But it provides the contractor
14 much more time to complete the road, gives you two lanes of
15 traffic, allows them the access to get all their material
16 handling, movement up the road and to do the construction at
17 the same time. But it definitely curtails the visitor
18 experience, in terms of someone who wants to just travel
19 over the road and see everything.

20 There are combinations with the alternatives. The
21 General Management Plan which is a handout received on
22 Monday, includes the status quo with the 15-minute maximum
23 and includes the night restriction. Mr. Gaskill thinks
24 alternative B, which is the accelerated construction, adds
25 in the seasonal restriction. So it's kind of looked at as

1 some combination of these. MK thinks there are advantages
2 to taking the best ones you can to maximize the visitor
3 experience and provides the best opportunity to get the
4 construction done during the time it needs to be done and
5 reduce the cost, reduce all the other impacts. And there
6 are other combinations that can be considered as well.

7 The options wouldn't be full, it wouldn't be a
8 complete list without having closure at the bottom. That is
9 the range of alternatives to how MK thinks they should
10 present the alternatives.

11 What MK wants to know from the Committee is how to
12 measure these alternatives. What are the factors that are
13 important to the Committee in evaluating the alternatives?

14 Questions are flooded.

15 MR. BROOKE: In terms of the -- oh, for
16 instance, just pick one of them, night restriction, does the
17 Park Service have data that says, you know, after 7:00 p.m.
18 we know that traffic on the road is only five percent of the
19 total traffic for the day. Or if we move that back to 6:00,
20 does that number jump ten percent, et cetera, so that you
21 know where you can maximize that cut-off if you start saying
22 We're going to close the Park from 6:35 on?

23 MR. GASKILL: There's good information on
24 traffic volumes on the road by time of day and pretty good
25 by season, as well. So that information is pretty good. I

1 thought you were going to ask another question, which is do
2 they have information on wildlife at nighttime. And that
3 one I don't have.

4 MR. BROOKE: Tony wanted to ask that.

5 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Thanks. It's nice for you to
6 ask Tony's questions for you. What was Tony's question
7 again, Will?

8 David?

9 MR. JACKSON: Apparently it takes about five
10 months to plow the road -- five weeks. I presume
11 construction can follow the plows?

12 MR. GASKILL: Seasonal restriction, we talked
13 about that. You know, there's two areas of the road, kind
14 of to be simplistic. There's the alpine section and the
15 lower section. And there's kind of two different seasons
16 that you could use this; the spring season and the fall
17 season. We felt that in the spring season, there's some
18 things you can do during the spring season which would be
19 things such as materials, storage, staging, getting ready
20 for the season. But you really couldn't do much in the
21 upper section of the road because of that road clearing.
22 But you could do some things in the lower section. So as
23 they clear the road up, they could start -- as the road
24 starts getting cleared up the pass, they could start working
25 on some of those lower sections.

1 Now, the fall season is where we thought that you
2 would get a lot more benefit, in terms of the alpine
3 section, if you were to close it, of course, at Labor Day.
4 And we could look at those traffic numbers. But you could
5 close it on Labor Day. But basically when they close it
6 right now, and by season you have five or six weeks of time
7 where a contractor could probably get a lot done in the
8 alpine section. And there's even an option there that maybe
9 during weekends it's opened up and it's just restricted
10 during the weekdays.

11 MR. JACKSON: And do you know enough about
12 the snowfall to know whether you could do some late season
13 plowing and continue to work? I mean, does the weather
14 really get socked in there in November or October or
15 December or January? In other words, is there a way of
16 moving the construction season further into the winter?
17 Does that come under this idea of seasonal stuff?

18 MR. GASKILL: I think there's opportunities
19 that you could move it through in the winter, if we could
20 work the other details out, other environmental issues that
21 might be out there because of seasonal wildlife issues. But
22 in terms of just winter operations, you can contract a lot
23 during the winter.

24 Now, the alpine section has some particular
25 concerns because of the avalanches. And there are ways to

1 work in an avalanche zone during the winter. But the cost
2 of trying to provide a safe environment probably wouldn't be
3 worth it in some of those avalanche zones. But down below
4 there's probably a lot of stuff that is closed right now
5 during the wintertime. I think we have the information at
6 least through the Park Service.

7 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Barney, go ahead.

8 MR. O'QUINN: It seems to me that as a group
9 we can kind of prioritize the importance of these issues.
10 But until you've got a construction alternative that you're
11 looking at and have some idea of what's going to be required
12 to do it, how you pull them together -- and I think it goes
13 without saying it's going to be some kind of
14 combination -- it's difficult to say Okay, we're going to do
15 this, that and the other until you know what the minimum
16 construction time to do a particular operation is. That's
17 almost a detail. You can conceptually, I think, come up
18 with something like a combination that we were talking
19 about. But to say this is hard line, this is the way we
20 want to do it, until we know what we're trying to do, it's
21 difficult to do.

22 MR. GASKILL: I think you're absolutely
23 right. We want to get your input on what you think is most
24 reasonable. But in terms of hard line, it's something
25 that's absolutely acceptable or not acceptable, that's hard

1 to say.

2 We do know from the work that was done earlier
3 that using the status quo, the night restriction and the
4 seasonal restriction, that the work can be done. It's just
5 a matter of how long it takes to get that done.

6 MR. O'QUINN: The one-hour maximum delay and,
7 if I remember, that's 30 minutes in each direction. It's a
8 30-minute delay in any one place at any one time.

9 MR. GASKILL: We said one hour for the total
10 road.

11 MR. O'QUINN: That's different.

12 MR. GASKILL: I guess the discussion here is,
13 is it worth pursuing a longer time of delay than what's
14 currently considered acceptable in the General Management
15 Plan? Is this something you think is worth considering,
16 because it would reduce the total construction time and it
17 would reduce costs and provide more opportunity for
18 construction. I mean, you might say that this is absolutely
19 not acceptable and maybe that's not acceptable and, you
20 know, we don't think this is a very good idea but it's worth
21 pursuing. Those are the types of things, I think, we're
22 looking for in terms of what we can do. But I think what's
23 the next part is what are the factors at how we measure
24 that. And that's part of the work group discussion is, I
25 think, going to be more important for us.

1 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Don?

2 MR. WHITE: Is the option of opening later
3 and closing earlier, does that come under closure?

4 MR. GASKILL: The seasonal restriction.

5 MR. WHITE: Even if the season is good, just
6 to delay opening maybe an extra week or so, is that
7 option --

8 MR. GASKILL: See by doing that, you
9 give -- basically delay it for a week, you would give the
10 contractor a week of time that he could be on the road with
11 the entire road available to do tasks that he would
12 otherwise be doing under construction with people riding.
13 But the trade-off, obviously, is the weather and the visitor
14 experience and the people who are there during that time.

15 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Tom, you had your hand up.

16 MR. MCDONALD: Yeah. All of your options
17 are, of course, dealing with vehicle access, which is
18 appropriate. But over the summer, I've been more familiar
19 with the Milwaukee Railroad grade, which is a pedestrian
20 bicycle pathway that's been constructed and been open for
21 about three years. And it's really, really popular. Is
22 there a way to have an option that would allow that type of
23 access and build it into one of these options?

24 MR. GASKILL: A pedestrian access?

25 MR. MCDONALD: And bicycle.

1 MR. GASKILL: Bicycle access. I think it's
2 probably something we want to look at. Because when we talk
3 about visitor use and visitor access, it's not just
4 automobile motorized. There are obviously people who hike
5 and bike up there. And you would -- it would be similar to
6 this. If you want to provide some bicycle access, and it's
7 a road bike, then you provide that during construction. I
8 think you would run into the same problems, in terms of
9 trying to keep a lane open, or maybe it's not as wide of a
10 lane, it's a little more opportunity. But you still have to
11 keep something open and a traffic management.

12 I think the pedestrian opportunity or the back
13 country trail, there are other trails that you can come up
14 there, and that's an opportunity. Maybe another opportunity
15 is for people who are on trails, there would be this managed
16 transit system. There would be a shuttle that would depart
17 at scheduled times during the day, and they would be
18 coordinated with the traffic with the construction itself.
19 And maybe they're three times a day. They're coming
20 through, and they're driven by -- the construction company
21 themselves actually run these things. And so they can get
22 through, they have the radios and all that stuff, and it
23 doesn't create much problem. There's a way to do it that
24 way. So you at least provide access to the Park, just not
25 vehicle access or access to these areas during those times.

1 I think that's something we need to consider, particularly
2 in the visitor use portion of the study. So those of you
3 who are interested in switching over to visitor
4 use/transportation group, there's a reason to do that.

5 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Couple more questions, then
6 we'll break up into our groups.

7 Paul, you had your hand up first.

8 MR. SLITER: I had a question for Jean. I
9 want to go back to Don's question. And if we delay the
10 opening a week, how do we measure the benefit to the
11 contractor versus the adverse condition created for the
12 local economy?

13 MS. TOWNSEND: That's a tough one. I think
14 from a construction standpoint, one question that I'm sure
15 Craig doesn't have the answer for today, but if we provided
16 another week on either end, what do we save, you know. Will
17 the road be accessible to everyone sooner -- I mean, did we
18 save a whole year, so we're balancing good stuff and bad
19 stuff? I think, as far as the question about the week on
20 either end, I would turn to our local economic development
21 folks. And not to put them -- not to ask them today, but
22 seek their advice, you know, as to what sort of impact this
23 would have. Now, we're not so much planning to quantify
24 that with absolute precision in dollars lost so much as if
25 we had to deal with this, you know, how would we work around

1 it, et cetera. So I think we can tackle the plus side and
2 the minus side and provide more information. But I guess a
3 question that I would have is, if we give up some of the
4 tourist season, what do we get? And so the question will
5 be -- a question for all of us will be, does that balance
6 the net to say positively, yes or no.

7 MR. SLITER: Right. And when you weigh that
8 back and forth, maybe what you learn is that what you gain
9 by letting the contractor be in there for, you know, longer,
10 means a quicker benefit -- yeah, we got to suck it up right
11 now, but maybe it means two weeks on either end instead of a
12 week. I don't know. That's why we need to figure out how
13 we can measure that. And I don't know if Susie or Linda or
14 anybody has any comment about that. But it would seem like
15 if we get two more miles up the road in exchange for a week
16 of closure in June, you know, how do we decide whether that
17 was beneficial to everybody or not?

18 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Linda, you had your hand up.

19 MS. ANDERSON: My question was, have we
20 looked at all at Yellowstone Park? Right after the fires
21 they had to completely rebuild the roads. And I believe
22 they restricted them during the day, and then at seven
23 o'clock at night or six o'clock at night, they had a pilot
24 car that took them through. A little bit different
25 situation than our park, but still, it would be interesting

1 to know what the effects were of that, economically, by
2 closing it in the middle of the day and taking people
3 through. If there were any traffic counts or anything like
4 that that perhaps we could look at. And it's not exactly
5 the same situation, but they still had to deal with closing
6 that road. And what did it do to the business?

7 And then in answer to Paul's question, I think one
8 of the things we could look at initially, in my mind, would
9 be bed tax collection. That's probably the quickest way to
10 look at what happens at the beginning of the season and the
11 end of the season; do an average, over four or five years.
12 Whether they were open by Memorial Day this year, that's
13 completely different. I don't know if that would be a way
14 to take a look at it and see.

15 MR. SLITER: That would make sense.

16 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Anna Marie.

17 MS. MOE: I don't think you can look at bed
18 tax collection because they're in three-month segments.
19 They report on a quarterly basis.

20 MS. ANDERSON: But you could look at history.

21 MS. MOE: But again, the bed tax collections
22 are from March, April -- or January.

23 MS. ANDERSON: January, February, March.

24 MS. MOE: January, February, March, April,
25 May and June are all together, as is the end of the season.

1 I mean, you're not going to be able to say if you
2 take -- right the month or the week.

3 MR. SLITER: But quarter two and quarter four
4 would be your beginning and end, you know. Quarter three is
5 what we know to be the bulk of the tourist season. So
6 quarter two and quarter three -- quarter two and quarter
7 four would be what information I think you could get the
8 most from.

9 MS. ANDERSON: Well, September would still be
10 part of that June, July, August.

11 MS. MOE: It's July, August, September.

12 MR. SLITER: Quarter three. So that would be
13 the one that has the bulk. And then the shoulders off the
14 bell would be two and four, I guess.

15 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Jean?

16 MS. TOWNSEND: Just on that point about bed
17 tax collection, one of the things that we are going to be
18 doing is a mail out-mail back survey of the businesses. And
19 we can ask if -- they don't have to report the data by
20 quarter to the state, we could ask them to give us a feel,
21 you know, each month about their monthly bed tax collection.
22 I mean, we don't need to ask them in dollars but, you know,
23 give us a feel of what percent is June, July, August, and
24 get a little bit better data.

25 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Barb, do you have something?

1 MS. PAHL: Is this a conversation we should
2 be having in our smaller groups?

3 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I'm thinking it is. Why
4 don't we break up into our smaller groups. We'll have a
5 chance to talk about them in our groups and then talk after
6 the smaller group meeting. Can you wait until we report
7 back?

8 MR. JACKSON: It's sort of on the factors
9 you're going to be talking to.

10 Craig, how do you -- isn't time a factor? I mean,
11 if you do status quo, like we discussed in our van
12 yesterday, it could take you forever to finish the road. So
13 isn't time a factor that ought to be included?

14 MR. GASKILL: Yeah. And our workshop
15 assignments, if you want to take it as an assignment, would
16 be to identify what those factors are. I think time is a
17 factor. And if it didn't get put on there, it is.

18 MR. GORDON: David, you brought up the
19 question about snow plowing. Just so everybody really
20 knows, that is status quo. We are doing that now. We are
21 plowing the contractor in late in the season. We're going
22 to be there, we think, first thing in the spring. Avalanche
23 and safety concerns are high on the contractor, and we're
24 concerned about it. But that is part of status quo. So
25 we're doing that.

1 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Okay.

2 MR. O'QUINN: One question on that. Are you
3 trying to give him drop in and out? Are you giving him a
4 different condition than what you would the general public
5 to go through?

6 MR. GORDON: Yeah. It's a different
7 condition. We close the road at a set day --

8 MR. O'QUINN: No, you closed it last week
9 because of conditions.

10 MR. GORDON: True.

11 MR. O'QUINN: Now those conditions, did they
12 stop the contractor from going in and out?

13 MR. GORDON: Actually, they did that day
14 because we didn't have, quite frankly, the logistics worked
15 out.

16 MR. O'QUINN: But under what you're planning
17 to do this fall for him, are you planning to give him the
18 same road conditions that you would want for the general
19 public?

20 MR. GORDON: I don't think so, no.

21 MR. O'QUINN: I wouldn't think so either.

22 MR. GORDON: Plus we're not going -- the
23 entire road won't be open.

24 MR. O'QUINN: I understand that too. But I'm
25 talking about the section you're going to allow him over.

1 MR. BABB: It will be one way for him as
2 opposed to plowing the whole road.

3 MS. PAHL: And with him, you can let him in
4 with an icier condition than you would the public on.

5 MR. GORDON: Right.

6 MR. O'QUINN: So you're not looking at the
7 same level of snow removal.

8 MR. GORDON: No, we're not.

9 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Why don't we break up into
10 our small groups.

11 MR. JACKSON: One more.

12 MR. JEWETT: I have a question about the
13 small groups, Randy. And it's a question that -- actually
14 when I was doing my homework last week, I needed to bring
15 up, if that's all right.

16 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Sure.

17 MR. JEWETT: And basically what I need to
18 know is each -- when I sit down with this transportation
19 group, the questions -- are we supposed to be addressing
20 questions that relate only to the reconstruction and
21 short-term solutions, recommendations to that? Or are we
22 supposed to integrate into our discussion a long-term vision
23 for the transportation plan for this Park that may lead
24 us -- it may lead as fundamental scoping ideas for a
25 transportation plan?

1 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I think I had some confusion
2 myself, because Craig -- the consultants wanted us to break
3 down into some small discussion groups for this meeting, and
4 these are a different set of discussion groups than the four
5 discussion groups that are going to be long-term continuing
6 for the rest of our process. So what we're talking about
7 now is just breaking down into three discussion groups that
8 are not focused on a specific area. Not the same groups
9 we've been talking about.

10 MR. JEWETT: Dealing with the traffic
11 management.

12 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Just dealing with this
13 question. All three groups will be talking about the same
14 set of factors that Craig has just been talking about. And
15 I had the same confusion myself, until I had it clarified
16 for me.

17 MR. JEWETT: So later today we'll be breaking
18 down into the other groups.

19 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Actually, I don't know if
20 we'll be breaking down to those other groups at this
21 meeting. But these are just three smaller discussion groups
22 for this one topic. Everybody talking about the same thing.
23 Is that responsive to your question?

24 MR. JEWETT: Yep.

25 MR. OGLE: All right.

1 MR. JACKSON: I have one question that I
2 think is actually important. The first list, rather than
3 the traffic management line, and that is the issue -- it
4 seems to me that some places are fairly high risk of failure
5 on the road at this time. For instance, I expect the reason
6 the Loop's being fixed now instead of later is because it
7 was a very risky place. And it would seem to me also that
8 that would affect, if there were some places really at risk
9 of failure, that would be a high priority to go to instead
10 of some nice orderly movement along the road. And I don't
11 think that fits into the way you talked about safety or
12 anything like that. And I wondered whether that impacts
13 traffic managements options.

14 MR. GASKILL: Did you have something. Randy?

15 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Yeah.

16 MR. GASKILL: The workshop groups -- if it's
17 okay with you, we actually have four questions we want to
18 ask. One of the questions relates to this. The other three
19 questions are not directly related to this, but they relate
20 to how we develop alternatives. But one of the questions
21 is -- it looks at short-term improvements. In fact, one of
22 the questions is, If you had two \$50,000 pots of money,
23 one's to short-term engineering needs, the other one's a
24 socioeconomic purpose of stimulating local and regional
25 growth, how would you spend these? An example might be

1 Well, if you have \$50,000 to spend right now, we need to fix
2 those priority projects. And there are -- we mentioned
3 three of them yesterday, and we also identified what we
4 think is a need to do some immediate maintenance, such as
5 cleaning out the culverts. You may feel that's the best way
6 to spend that. But I think your input is something that
7 particular question is going to.

8 MR. JACKSON: Okay, I'm satisfied; thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Why don't we go ahead and
10 break up into these groups and we can have our discussions,
11 and then we'll have a chance to visit further about this
12 after the small group discussions. And do you have these
13 list of questions that you are going to distribute?

14 --o0o--

15 (At 9:00 a.m. the Advisory Committee breaks up
16 into three workshop groups as indicated by Chairman Ogle.
17 The groups worked together until 10:30 a.m., at which time
18 each group gave their presentation.)

19 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Let's get started. Jayne
20 graciously volunteered to be the spokesman for group one.

21 MS. KREMENIK: That's not quite the way I
22 remember it. But first of all, I'd like to say it was just
23 a supreme pleasure to work with such an intellectually
24 superior group. And the answers are the model answers, of
25 which I'm sure. Being in a group of such intellect, it was

1 hard for me to stumble.

2 First thing we wanted to do was, from that
3 list -- can I just pull this back out here?

4 From this list we decided to strike some of the
5 ones we thought were not alternatives to be considered. So
6 the first ones we've removed were no action, closure and
7 status quo. We didn't feel that those were things our group
8 wanted to have as alternatives. So we divided our
9 recommendations into three acceptable recommendations and
10 ways to proceed.

11 First of all, we thought that shoulder season
12 access was one of the alternatives to be considered. We
13 would recommend unrestricted use on certain sections for the
14 contractor. So not meaning that entire road would be closed
15 in the off season, but perhaps certain sections of it could
16 be closed so that visitors would still have access to
17 Logan's Pass or the east or west side as needed by the
18 contractor.

19 We decided that we could put some date parameters
20 based on the traffic patterns. We suggested Memorial Day to
21 Labor Day, where it would be open to the public and then
22 closed for just the contractor from those dates. But that
23 is just a recommendation. We're expecting the consultant to
24 come back with clear dates and parameters there.

25 We suggested that the lower elevations be plowed

1 for contractor use only. That meant in the shoulder season.
2 So that from the -- say, from the gates at where we saw them
3 yesterday at Lake McDonald, that as far as it could be
4 plowed up in the spring and kept open, and the fall, for the
5 contractor to use with no public access. So those would be
6 closed off.

7 The second recommendation was that we would be
8 agreeable to maintaining one-lane access with delays during
9 the daylight. We decided a maximum of two 15-minute delays
10 on the entire road. So there could be two construction
11 areas along the road, each with a maximum of a 15-minute
12 delay. So if you were traveling the road all the way up and
13 all the way back, you'd have a maximum of a one-hour of
14 delay over the course of the whole road. Or if you're
15 traveling in one direction, you'd have two 15-minute delays
16 for a maximum half an hour.

17 We decided that nighttime closure was an option.
18 Our suggested range was closure from 9:00 p.m. to 8:00 a.m.
19 We'd like the consultant to recommend an optimum time within
20 that range. We did recognize there might be some
21 difficulties with nighttime restrictions; maybe the Park
22 Service would have difficulty clearing out cars and back
23 country visitors and things like that and that the road
24 might not lend itself rather well to night work. But it was
25 something that our group was willing to consider.

1 Managed transit. We decided that that would have
2 the same problems for the contractor as any traffic on the
3 road at all. But we did decide that it could be part of the
4 long-term park transportation plan, just not one of the
5 construction alternatives. We felt that the contractor had
6 to let buses through or let carloads through, and it
7 probably didn't make too much difference in terms of how the
8 work could be done.

9 As far as restricting one side, in other words,
10 closing the road from Logan Pass either to the east or west,
11 we decided that was not an acceptable option, but we thought
12 it would be really useful to have some numbers in terms of
13 time and cost to use as a baseline to measure the other
14 alternatives by. I guess our concern was that we were
15 removing that as an option, not seeing that that was the
16 most feasible option in terms of time and cost. Even though
17 we don't like it as an option, we think it's good to have
18 that information.

19 In terms of combinations, we are comfortable with
20 combinations of any of our three chosen methods; the
21 seasonal restrictions, one-way traffic and nighttime
22 restriction.

23 For question number two, the factors that we are
24 considering was time, money, room for the contractor to
25 operate safely, public access, and economic impacts.

1 Our third question is about the \$50,000 pot of
2 money -- two pots of \$50,000, and what we would do with
3 that. For the first one, we decided that we would hire one
4 new maintenance worker to perform duties as outlined by the
5 Park, as maintenance seemed to be one of the major points of
6 concern with the options we were considering. The other
7 50,000 was we would focus on a PR strategy that would focus
8 visitors on other parts of the Park that did not relate to
9 the road. We figured there was currently not enough
10 information out that were not road based, and we thought the
11 Park should base that on.

12 The summary was the Committee felt that the charge
13 of our committee was to minimize the economic impact and
14 stimulate economic growth. So that's what we were trying to
15 do with our two \$50,000 pots.

16 And question number four we thought was outside
17 the parameters for the purpose of our committee, so we
18 didn't address that.

19 MR. SLITER: Cop out.

20 MS. KREMENIK: Any questions? Did I cover
21 that, group? Was that all right?

22 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Questions of Jayne or for
23 group one?

24 MR. BROOKE: Jayne, I assume when you talk
25 about closure, seasonal closures set Memorial and Labor Day,

1 open and closed after that, that's a recommendation
2 for -- to come back and tell us what's the impact of being
3 closed in September in the Park?

4 MS. KREMENIK: Right.

5 MR. BROOKE: And you guys haven't bought into
6 that without knowing what the numbers are.

7 MS. KREMENIK: Right. We wanted to suggest
8 that as a potential date and see what -- where the
9 traffic -- numbers of traffic lay either side of that date
10 and what impacts would be from there.

11 CHAIRMAN OGLE: And we -- Will, part of our
12 discussion was the fact that, of course, we would like to
13 know -- have some information on how -- what percentage of
14 the business's bottom line in the area is generated in the
15 shoulder seasons after Labor Day, before Memorial Day to,
16 therefore, have an idea of the impact on the businesses for
17 closure during those periods of time. And we're hoping that
18 there will be some studying going on on those questions and
19 be factored into an alternative. We don't have that
20 information yet, but we think that that would be good to
21 have.

22 MR. BROOKE: And I think just as a -- so that
23 the people who are thinking about it and studying these
24 kinds of consideration, one of the things I know from our
25 business, you operate through the summer, you know, paying

1 your expenses, et cetera, and you look at September as
2 really the money that starts dropping the bottom line. It's
3 kind of last-dollar evaluations. So it's a bigger dollar,
4 if you will, than up in June, if that makes sense, because
5 it's dropping to the bottom.

6 MS. KREMENIK: We are also assuming that that
7 was a recommendation based on the contractor needing those
8 amounts of time to do the work. And that we felt like we
9 really didn't have to say that the types of work that could
10 be done based on one-lane closures and limited access would
11 be done on one-lane closures. They wouldn't close entire
12 sections if they didn't need to be closed. But that went
13 without saying.

14 MR. JEWETT: Just to stand on that, we had a
15 discussion, Will, about asking the contractor to take a look
16 to try to compartmentalize some of the rehabilitation tasks.
17 For instance, culverts versus falls, road paving versus
18 arches, whatever. And compartmentalizing them and trying to
19 match them with seasonal options and closure options so that
20 there's an optimization of what they're working on when
21 around these other considerations.

22 MS. KREMENIK: We'd ask the consultant and
23 not the contractor.

24 MR. JEWETT: The consultant, I'm sorry.

25 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Another part of that same

1 discussion had to do with the fact that probably the most
2 likely time for work during the season closure would be in
3 the fall. And that's the most likely time to be doing the
4 high alpine work, so the lower elevations may be able to be
5 still open doing the high alpine work during the fall.

6 Well, Jayne, thank you and your group for doing a
7 stellar job on that.

8 All right; who is the spokesman for group two?

9 MS. PAHL: Group two, group two.

10 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Group two, do you have a
11 spokesman?

12 MR. SLITER: I thought I was just the writer.
13 You sort of left that part out.

14 Okay; we started by saying that three things that
15 we didn't consider to be good options were no action,
16 closure and then the one-hour maximum delays. We think that
17 the General Management Plan calls for half-hour delays
18 maximum. We think that this is reasonable, and we also
19 think that during those delays, rangers and/or naturalists
20 should be on hand in the car lineup to interpret both the
21 project and the Park to give the people some sort of an
22 experience. That they're not just sitting and waiting,
23 they're actually getting something out of it while they're
24 stopped.

25 When we talk about public transportation, we

1 recognize that parking can be an issue. If you're going to
2 put everybody on a Jammer bus or a bus or a tram or anything
3 like that, you need a place to put all the vehicles.
4 Because the vehicles normally are going over the pass; okay?
5 So if we start putting everybody onto some mode of
6 transportation to go over the top, we have to have someplace
7 to put all the vehicles, which I don't think we have right
8 now, since we've got parking problems as it is.

9 We did discuss shuttles, more concessionaires
10 possibly, more contract-type people, and that obviously goes
11 toward negotiations between the Park Service and current
12 concessionaires. Anything like that would be up to the Park
13 Service. We think that red Jammer buses will be available
14 again within the next couple of years, which we don't
15 anticipate any of the heavy construction work is going to
16 start by then. So perhaps Jammer buses can help to lighten
17 some of the traffic on the road.

18 One-way traffic was discussed being possibly just
19 during the week, so that when the real heavy traffic comes
20 on the weekends, you know, it's probably likely that a lot
21 of contractors will work four tens. Hopefully we'd be able
22 to put into the contract they'd work more than that, but we
23 have to accept the fact that the bulk of the traffic comes
24 on the weekends.

25 Encouragement of the use of the Highway 2 loop

1 brings more traffic into the area, spreads the wealth around
2 a little bit. And I think that if we promoted it properly,
3 that the loop using Highway 2 would be a benefit of one-way
4 traffic.

5 MR. O'QUINN: Are you talking about strictly
6 complete one-way traffic, or are you talking about regulated
7 back and forth one-way traffic?

8 MR. SLITER: Regulated back and forth. But
9 that causes some problems logistically also for people that
10 go one way anticipating going all the way through but they
11 want to stop at the top and hike in at Hidden Lake and then
12 they find out that they've got to come back out the way they
13 came because the traffic pattern has now switched. I mean,
14 that would require some more discussion. But clearly, you
15 know, a one-way option needs to be considered.

16 Night closures definitely need to be considered.
17 Probably from late in the afternoon or earlier evening to
18 maybe even as late as mid-morning, allowing, of course, for
19 the hikers to get into the woods as early as they can and
20 still be able to get out at the end of their hike.

21 We talked about seasonal closures, a short end
22 season, possibly June 20th to September 15th being the
23 open -- the open period. We need to emphasize that the Sun
24 Road is one attraction of the Park only. I mean, it's not
25 the whole Park. We have to emphasize that there are a lot

1 of other opportunities for enjoyment of the Park other than
2 the highway itself. Downplay the closure during the early
3 season and the late season to encourage people to go to
4 other parts of the Park. And we said that the public
5 relations is going to be vital if we're going to exercise an
6 option like this.

7 One-side restrictions. We recognize that closing
8 the west side has many more benefits to the east side than
9 closing the east side has benefits to the west. But we also
10 recognize that since the west side has the majority of the
11 traffic, that, you know, perhaps, once again, we can spread
12 the wealth around to the Essex, Summit, East Glacier, Babb,
13 Browning, St. Mary, and up into Canada that would help to
14 spur more traffic that way. Again, this would take major
15 public relations efforts. And we recognize, also, that the
16 east side may not ultimately need to be closed completely.
17 So we did talk about closure of the west side and what that
18 might mean for the west side businesses. But since the
19 majority is coming from that direction already, perhaps, you
20 know, it would be easier to mitigate that.

21 Question number two, what factors do you feel are
22 important in evaluating the alternatives, we said that the
23 long-term benefits are definitely a factor. The visitor
24 experience. New offerings of services and products,
25 products meaning opportunities for the visitor. We said

1 that the cost of construction and the cost of an
2 effectiveness of mitigation are both factors. Future
3 maintenance, planning and funding needs to be a factor in
4 all of this project, and planning the project based on
5 averages in what we've seen in the weather over the past
6 period of, you know, maybe ten years or whatever it is. If
7 we can base the project plan on -- if we can have some sort
8 of plan in place based on what we assume is going to happen
9 with the weather. We all know how unpredictable it is up
10 here. But we definitely need to start someplace.

11 With the \$50,000 pots of money, we definitely
12 think with regard to engineering and the road itself, that
13 the first priority needs to be to stop the bleeding. And we
14 expanded on that a little bit, because it's sort of a broad,
15 you know, generality buzz word. But the life-threatening
16 factors clearly need to be the first priority. Drainage and
17 culverts. We've heard that, you know, they need to be
18 cleaned out. Maybe there needs to be more of them. We need
19 to work on drainage to help protect what's still there.
20 Proper maintenance staff and funding needs to be addressed.
21 And that probably could be done by reprioritization of other
22 Park resources. And I don't know exactly how to quantify
23 that. You know, we had some discussion about what that
24 meant. Basically, it's an overall view of what is the Park
25 doing now, recognize the Road is a priority. At some point

1 in time a portion of it could actually fall off the face of
2 the mountain. Are other things that are being paid for
3 right now the priority that need to be addressed? Maybe we
4 need to move some resources into maintenance to protect what
5 we have.

6 Socioeconomic stimulation and growth. We said
7 that gathering of more information through further survey is
8 something that would be important -- oh, also I wanted to
9 say that very likely this all isn't going to happen with
10 \$50,000. But we kind of took that to be a general question
11 as to If you had a pot of money, what would you do with it
12 and how would you prioritize it? That was where we came
13 from with that.

14 Seminars for businesses. Inviting other
15 businesses that have gone through the same types of problems
16 from other parks, how they worked through their closures and
17 limited seasons, anything like that. We could gain
18 information from the other places that have experienced the
19 same thing. Also, improve the business opportunities on
20 both the Blackfeet and the Flathead reservations to expand
21 the opportunities for the tribes during what could
22 definitely be a trying time.

23 Defining a world class visitor experience to us
24 means authenticity and uniqueness. We recognize that this
25 place is unique and we need to maintain that. We don't want

1 any bunny ears or mouse ears becoming part of the persona of
2 the place. And encouragement to the businesses and to the
3 concessionaires that legendary customer service lends itself
4 to a world class destination experience. If people leave
5 here with the experience that Wow, everything was great but
6 the people weren't all that friendly, you know, that
7 definitely detracts from the experience.

8 Maintenance of the historical integrity of the
9 area. Definitely -- people -- we talked a little
10 bit -- actually, we talked quite a bit about the Lewis and
11 Clark expedition celebration that's going to be coming up
12 and the historical significance of that and how it needs to
13 be maintained and the whole historical significance of the
14 area.

15 We talked a little bit about the benefits that
16 Glacier National Park and the area enjoy because of the
17 world heritage site designation. International visitors
18 evidently have been polled as saying that the designation is
19 one of the primary reasons why they would visit Glacier
20 National Park from outside the country. And not just Canada
21 but throughout Europe and the east. So that's what we did.

22 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Questions for Paul or group
23 two?

24 Anna Marie.

25 MS. MOE: Well, actually, just more of a

1 clarification. As far as you have Travel Montana survey
2 data type of stuff, Travel Montana could provide like names
3 and addresses of people that have inquired information. But
4 as far as actually doing a survey, Travel Montana doesn't do
5 those. To institute a tourism recreation research, probably
6 the university system would be the proper means to do the
7 survey.

8 MR. SLITER: Yesterday we had some discussion
9 about the individuals who had anticipated coming to Montana
10 as having contact with Travel Montana. And I think that the
11 idea behind this was getting those names from Travel Montana
12 about who had inquired about coming. And I think it was
13 Will that yesterday had discussed wanting to know, you know,
14 what would encourage or detract them from wanting to come to
15 the Park, based on what's going to be going on in the Park.
16 And those names would be available.

17 MS. MOE: And I just wanted to say that.

18 MR. SLITER: Not necessarily that they would
19 conduct the survey.

20 Suzann.

21 MS. LEWIS: Under the seminars to inform and
22 stimulate entrepreneurship and notification by what has been
23 done in other parks, is there someone on the Committee that
24 has -- can recommend a contact to the consultants to get
25 some feedback from the recent work on Idaho, downtown

1 Kalispell? That was a huge project that really changed
2 traffic patterns for at least what, Randy, three weeks?

3 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Yeah, I'd say three or four.

4 MS. LEWIS: All those businesses along Idaho
5 were, in effect, very heavily impacted by how traffic flowed
6 through this. And I was wondering, the consultants could be
7 given some contacts to talk with how did they come up with
8 that plan, what was the reaction of the merchants and what
9 were some of the proactive planning. I guess one of the
10 things that popped in my head, that Smith's grocery store
11 obviously changed their changeout to the new store, the
12 construction of their new store and the construction of
13 their parking lot to coincide with what was going to be a
14 major disruption in traffic. And I'd just be curious how
15 they worked through that whole plan. I think it's an
16 excellent idea, there just may be some opportunities to
17 learn. Because all kinds of businesses were impacted by
18 that on Idaho.

19 Do you know who they might? To you.

20 MS. TOWNSEND: Joe Underwriter, who is the
21 vice-president of Kalispell Chamber of Commerce can help us
22 out, I'm sure.

23 MS. LEWIS: Great.

24 MR. BROOK: And I think, to follow up on
25 that, Great Falls -- we talked about the Great Falls

1 experience.

2 MR. SLITER: 10th Avenue.

3 MR. BROOKE: The Great Falls Chamber Of
4 Commerce ought to be contacted and explain how not to do it.

5 MR. SLITER: Brian?

6 MR. BAKER: I just wanted to clarify one
7 thing. When we talked about closure of one side or the
8 other, we weren't really saying closure of the west side.
9 What we were saying was restriction on the west side.
10 Because basically, the entrance station and the road would
11 be open probably up to Lake McDonald, maybe even a little
12 bit further to Packer's Roost or whatever for hiking
13 experience or whatever. So it wasn't like a closure of the
14 west side, it was a restriction on the west side. High
15 alpine section, yes, would be closed.

16 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Also, the Committee would
17 like to amplify on what Paul or Brian have said.

18 Linda.

19 MS. ANDERSON: Just one other thing. When we
20 talked about the study with Travel Montana, Glacier Country
21 has a data base of names, and particularly those who said
22 they wanted to come to Glacier Park. So those names would
23 be available.

24 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Anything else?

25 Fred?

1 MR. BABB: One more question for our
2 clarification, and that was on the sheet with the pots of
3 money. Are they in any particular priority or not? Maybe
4 you said that and we just missed it over here.

5 MR. SLITER: We kind of threw them all out as
6 ideas, and I just wrote them out in order that they came
7 out. But I would think that from -- well, maybe they came
8 up in our minds in the same priority, but life-threatening
9 issues definitely need to be addressed first. And I would
10 say that the other three sort of fall together in a sense,
11 because if there is only X number of dollars available for
12 maintenance right now, then concentration of the drainage
13 and culverts and using the proper amounts of funding and
14 staff for maintenance may require a reprioritization. So I
15 think those three sort of all go hand in hand. But
16 definitely, the life-threatening issues need to be addressed
17 first.

18 MR. BABB: And how about under the second
19 one, Paul, the socioeconomic?

20 MR. SLITER: Anybody want to -- we did not
21 prioritize those.

22 Tom.

23 MR. MCDONALD: I thought number three was.

24 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Anything else from group two?

25 Okay; who's the spokesman for group three?

1 MR. BROOKE: Right here.

2 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Will.

3 MR. BROOKE: First of all, I want to thank my
4 mom and dad. And a point here, who's the bum with
5 University of Montana Grizzly coffee cup in front of my
6 place?

7 MR. DAKIN: I am. Go Griz.

8 MR. BROOKE: Whoever it is got some on my
9 papers; return them.

10 Okay. Other recommendations starting with the
11 first one. We didn't go through each one necessarily and
12 say concur or not concur. We started by here are some other
13 possible recommendations that might be considered that
14 weren't on there.

15 Pedestrians, bicycle or what we call other access
16 including motorcycles, mopeds. Does that accomplish
17 anything is a questionmark. There's still safety issues
18 that might be associated with it. But it certainly might
19 provide narrower access, maybe get somebody somewhere, we're
20 not sure about that. But it's something for the consultants
21 and Park Service to consider.

22 The restriction or the alternative about one-hour
23 maximum here, we're not sure how that was derived. And if
24 we put up an artificial number there and should it be two
25 hours, three hours or three-and-a-half hours, we were

1 curious. Somebody said that for the contractor, at some
2 point every minute beyond two hours becomes a much more
3 productive minute than the first hour, I think is what I
4 heard. And so what kind of costs are associated with
5 expanding these times? Do you get more efficiencies? And
6 this goes back to this Park Service information and data.
7 If you start closing at, for instance, 6:00 to 9:00 in the
8 morning and the evening for three hours instead of one hour,
9 for instance, do you get some big work done or more
10 efficiencies and yet the effect on the visitor and the
11 surrounding economies is fairly -- is smaller?

12 One day per week closure. We didn't see that that
13 was necessarily in the alternatives and, again, something to
14 consider and see what the impacts are. If that gets the
15 contractor anywhere -- if it mitigates some of the impacts
16 on the visitor and the surrounding area.

17 One of the observations we had was consistency is
18 cool. Businesses and visitors can plan and understand if we
19 know that these -- one of these or a combination of them is
20 going to be used and it's not constantly changing. Don't
21 change the rules. Do provide signage and advertising that
22 clearly states what the rules are, that we're not finding
23 out at the gate what the rules are. You know well before
24 you get to the Park.

25 Let's see, five, effectively present fixes,

1 repairs, et cetera. This is kind of an interesting notion
2 here. We're going through -- for instance, the example was
3 what we're doing on the -- what is it, the Big Bend where
4 we're injecting concrete into the --

5 MR. BABB: The loop.

6 MR. BROOKE: -- the loop. What is the
7 long-term effect? Let's say we start doing the major fix on
8 the road five years out, but in the meantime we've done some
9 pretty significant fixes along the way. We've ticked off
10 high priority items and so now we're five years down the
11 road and we don't have quite the extensive job that we
12 thought we were going to have to begin with, particularly in
13 mind of what we heard yesterday. That there's a lot of
14 these critical areas that are in pretty good shape in terms
15 of the bottom part. And it's the top fifth that needs
16 repairing and replacing. So what is the effect of that?
17 And if you run that out, is it going to be as bad and as
18 ugly as we think it is? And that needs to be addressed
19 somehow, somewhat.

20 Concur or not concur in the alternatives. We
21 didn't really spend a lot of time going through each of the
22 other alternatives. We had a general sense that the no
23 action and closure would fall out because of economic
24 impacts and other impacts. It was extreme measure on either
25 end of the spectrum.

1 In materials of factors, there were factors that
2 were listed there, and we concur in those factors. But we
3 looked at them and said These are the most important factors
4 to our group; economic impact, time to complete the
5 construction, visitor experience which we broke down into
6 delays, and during the visitor experience could they be
7 educated, entertained? Could there be facilities provided
8 if there were these half-hour stops or one-hour stops?
9 Could there be facilities, for instance, bathroom facilities
10 they could use? Could they be educated at the site before
11 traveling to the construction site if there is such a thing,
12 and at the site as well. Opportunities to see the
13 Going-to-the-Sun Road, again, visitor experience. Some of
14 the factors, impacts on length of stay and use by the
15 visitor.

16 Then the other factor probably, I think, that we
17 focused on, and no surprise here, dollars and cost. And
18 when we say dollars, we look at it in a slightly different
19 way. And I guess I go to the Great Falls experience. When
20 we say efficient, we mean, are we saving some short-term
21 dollars or could we be adding dollars up front to the
22 contract by giving the contractor incentive to do the job
23 not only quickly but not 40-hour weeks?

24 In Great Falls, my understanding, for those of you
25 who aren't familiar or either out of state, they redid 10th

1 Avenue South, which was a major main street of Great Falls.
2 Businesses on both sides. It was a mess. It -- I don't
3 know what the numbers are, but they had to have put
4 businesses out of business there because of the way they did
5 it. And there was lots of screaming and yelling at the
6 contractor. And the contractor said Look, this job was bid
7 on 40 hours a week, no overtime, and that's the way I'm
8 going to do this job. And if they had added the money up
9 front to pay the contractor more, put more people on it
10 longer hours, and know that it was just going to be a more
11 expensive contract, the theory is they wouldn't have had
12 these lost businesses. They would have saved money over
13 time because tax coffers wouldn't reflect those lost
14 businesses.

15 And one of the factors we also noted here is
16 contractor experience or the ability of the contractor to
17 work in these kinds of elevations and under these kinds of
18 conditions, whatever conditions they come up with. Safety
19 was another important factor. And then Tony would be very
20 proud of us, resource and wildlife issues. And this is -- I
21 don't know if this is a factor or not, but we put it in
22 there, that whatever we do is maintenance friendly so that
23 over the long term, we're not back in here five years
24 redoing this thing and disrupting all the economies again.

25 Staging, this is something that was in the list of

1 factors. I don't know as it was given a lot of
2 consideration as we talked about these other options. But I
3 guess the reason it came up is we kept hearing about staging
4 yesterday from the Park Service. And it seemed like there
5 was a little bit of -- I don't know if I want to say
6 confusion, but there needs to be more of a recognition that
7 there are going to be some impacts here, no matter how we do
8 this, and staging is a fairly critical component of how we
9 do this.

10 For instance, if we're staging far away outside
11 the Park, we're going to rip up the road -- I heard
12 yesterday coming in -- because we've got heavy truck traffic
13 on the road that we have spent a lot of money and time
14 redoing versus staging it closer to the site. The Park
15 Service people that we were with yesterday were concerned
16 about some of the impacts and visual impacts. But the
17 reality is, there's going to be some of that. And we need to
18 be realistic about that and deal with it accordingly.

19 Fifty thousand dollar pot of gold. The first one,
20 socioeconomic, public relation and advertising to emphasize
21 there's other things at Glacier besides Going-to-the-Sun.
22 And then probably as important, this is preconstruction,
23 whether these efforts are productive and produce positive
24 results; i.e., are there more visitors going to Glacier, are
25 we spreading the visitors out, or are we continuing to see a

1 decline in visitation?

2 Secondly, to leverage these dollars. Another
3 possibility or maybe in conjunction with this, leverage
4 these dollars with partnerships. Travel Montana, for
5 instance, had on the board a \$30,000 chunk of change
6 specifically directed to Glacier. And what happens if you
7 leverage the 50,000 to say Look, we'll put in 50 but it
8 needs to be matched twice. So we're talking about 150,000.
9 And still, you know, focus on the issue of Glacier and
10 Glacier visitation.

11 The engineering, \$50,000, prioritize projects to
12 avoid failure, i.e., get better data. We're concerned by
13 what we heard yesterday that we have lots of visual
14 reconnaissance, but we're not so sure that the one we're
15 working on today is going to fail tomorrow or 50 years from
16 now. So we're working on project A today when, really, we
17 should have been working on project C, because of
18 priorities. We're guessing about the priorities instead of
19 having better data to know where we ought to start. And if
20 we were going to spend 50,000 on engineering, that would be
21 an area we would want to consider.

22 Drainage followed the other group. It became
23 clear and is becoming clearer that that's a continuing
24 problem. And instead of allowing it to continue, so we're
25 not on a treadmill, you focus design -- or engineering the

1 money on designing solutions to start fixing the drainage
2 problem immediately. And then maintenance. We recognize
3 that's not necessarily engineering, but we think it's tied
4 back into priorities and criticalness.

5 There you have it.

6 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Great. Any questions?

7 (Applause.)

8 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Questions for Will or anybody
9 else on group three, who would like to clarify or add to
10 what Will has said? Very clear, Will.

11 Barb.

12 MS. PAHL: I have a question for group one
13 and three. Why didn't you guys want to talk about what you
14 think the world class visitor experience is?

15 MR. BROOKE: Oh, we did.

16 MS. PAHL: I didn't hear that.

17 MS. LEWIS: You didn't give it.

18 MR. BROOKE: It's up there, isn't it?

19 MS. PAHL: What the goal is, what the vision
20 is.

21 CHAIRMAN OGLE: While Will is coming up here,
22 I think group one thought it was beyond the scope of the
23 purposes of the Committee.

24 MR. JEWETT: We were trying to use our time
25 and resources.

1 CHAIRMAN OGLE: We were trying to be a little
2 more efficient.

3 MR. SLITER: Yeah, you guys were all standing
4 around looking at each other.

5 MR. BROOKE: This is very important. World
6 class visitors, predictability and consistency, so you can
7 plan and know what it is you're going to get. Services are
8 provided. The surrounding businesses are doing well,
9 reinvesting in the facilities and making improvements so
10 that when they can come to visit you've got updated
11 electrical and campground instead of whole depleted wiring,
12 those kinds of things.

13 The visitor experience, again, we referred back to
14 C, and this whole thing here. Services provided assumes
15 that businesses are not disrupted and they can continue to
16 reinvest in the businesses to not only maintain the existing
17 experience but continue to improve it. And then we refer to
18 visitor experience. Going back to this; delays, they're
19 educated, entertained, have appropriate facilities, have
20 opportunities to see Going-to-the-Sun Road, whether or not
21 there's construction on it someday, somehow, and then
22 impacts on length of stay and use.

23 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Thanks, Will.

24 MR. SLITER: That made it even better.

25 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Anything else for group

1 three? Okay.

2 --o0o--

3 The next action taken by the Committee was to try
4 to consolidate the suggestions that came out of the work
5 groups and see what the Committee agrees upon as
6 recommendations to the consultant to consider. Craig
7 Gaskill volunteered to consolidate, upon the Committee's
8 direction.

9 Mr. Babb suggests the Committee look at all the
10 options and go through the preliminary three sheets and see
11 if there's anything that the Committee can't live with as a
12 whole and then just go through it that way.

13 Mr. Gaskill states the areas that helped MK were
14 two of the groups said they didn't think that no action was
15 an acceptable alternative. Both those groups also said that
16 the total road closure was not an acceptable alternative.
17 That gives MK clear direction to not even bother studying
18 that because you're just wasting your time doing that.

19 There was some discussion that the nighttime
20 closure is certainly something worth considering; the
21 seasonal closure was worth considering. MK needs to
22 determine what the best times would be, and they have
23 information to do that. Data can collected both from the
24 economic standpoint and the cost standpoint to determine
25 what is the best way to do it. So that gives us some

1 direction on that. And there's some concurrence that MK can
2 combine all the alternatives. That gives MK some good
3 direction. So MK thinks they know they're in the right
4 direction. Looking for fatal flaws, things that MK
5 shouldn't do, they think they've got that.

6 Ms. Pahl recommends two things that absolutely
7 should be done. Whatever remedies are chosen at a given
8 point in construction, that they are well articulated to the
9 public in advance; it's in the newspapers, it's in hotels
10 and motels; that people know that whatever it is being done,
11 people can make their plans accordingly.

12 The other suggestion was the opportunities at the
13 delays to provide education. To make the delay part of the
14 experience. Not just sitting in their car waiting, but
15 maybe being able to get out of their car, getting a talk
16 about the original engineering, talking about the wildlife
17 or whatever so that it actually can be built in that there's
18 a benefit to the delay. It's not just sitting in your car,
19 sitting on the bus or whatever vehicle you're in.

20 Mr. Gaskill thinks that's a good recommendation because that
21 gives a lot of input into the type of visitor experience
22 that MK might want to provide as part of the alternatives.

23 Mr. O'Quinn suggests a discussion on the
24 one-day-a-week closure. It was then decided to approach the
25 concurrence by going through each group's sheets

1 individually and seeing what the Committee can concur on
2 rather than an overall view.

3 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Here's the master list.

4 MR. GASKILL: We're going to cross no action
5 out. Status quo, I heard two different opinions on that.
6 I'm not sure if it was just a miscommunication. What we
7 meant by the status quo was basically what they're doing
8 right now. It's the limitations that they're currently
9 working under. That's the 15-minute per construction side
10 for two sides, maximum 30-minute delay. But Jack identified
11 that there's a little more to it. They're also providing
12 early season and late season access by snow plowing. And I
13 don't know, is there any nighttime construction as part of
14 that?

15 MR. GATTEN: No. We do allow two-hour
16 closures on some days of the week, like 8:00 to 10:00 p.m.

17 MS. LEWIS: Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday.

18 MR. GATTEN: Because the contractor needed a
19 little more time to deliver equipment.

20 MR. O'QUINN: How would the public know that?

21 MS. LEWIS: Signage.

22 MR. O'QUINN: Where do you hit the gate?

23 MS. LEWIS: As soon as you come across the
24 bridge, and the entrance station.

25 MR. O'QUINN: That's the only time you'd know

1 it.

2 MS. LEWIS: It's in the newspaper on a
3 regular basis. It's been public knowledge since the
4 beginning of it.

5 MS. PAHL: I don't think I've seen that on
6 the web page.

7 MS. LEWIS: It's not on the web page.

8 MR. GASKILL: So there should be.

9 MR. O'QUINN: I think you should know it
10 before you hit the Park, if you're going to be closed on
11 Tuesday night if you're planning to go to Waterton and come
12 back.

13 MR. GASKILL: So would it be fair to say that
14 status quo is an acceptable option but with better public
15 information. This was half-hour maximum one way; this is
16 two-hour maximum one way. There was discussion about a
17 two-hour maximum. That would be a longer period of time, as
18 opposed to a half hour, which is what this one is. So let's
19 stay back in the status quo. Is there general agreement
20 that the status quo isn't acceptable?

21 MR. BABB: I know I'm not on the Committee,
22 but I think status quo is important because it's a baseline
23 of information. And using what Randy -- or Barney, rather,
24 used as the example is, we assess that and we say what was
25 good and bad. And let's just say the information to the

1 public could have been better. Let's just say,
2 hypothetically, then, to me we look at that and we'll be
3 making changes like that next year. I mean, we're going to
4 assess what's happened this first year because the
5 construction occurs next year, and we're going to be
6 modifying that. And I just think it's a baseline that we can
7 all work from and learn from, and it's real important to
8 analyze that.

9 MR. GASKILL: And it's real important in the
10 General Management Plan.

11 CHAIRMAN OGLE: So is status quo acceptable
12 as a group as an alternative to consider?

13 MR. GASKILL: One-hour max. There were a
14 couple different things that maybe the one-hour wasn't the
15 right amount of time. I think the other one voted to
16 eliminate. So I guess that needs a little discussion.
17 Should we consider that as an option? And if we do, is the
18 one-hour the right amount of time? Two questions.

19 MS. PAHL: Actually, a comment, not a
20 question. I think that, you know, especially if you've got
21 to say two hours to go along with -- what was that, group
22 three, that pink group, recommended, I think as of a visitor
23 you might rather just not park yourself up there for two
24 hours and rather have an experience where either it's a
25 one-way or it's open from this hour to that hour where it's

1 closed another time, or you could find yourself sitting up
2 there for a long time. It's a long time to entertain people
3 like on the other side. So I think if you start getting
4 into the one to two hours, you might look at some other
5 options, rather than just keeping people in their cars for
6 that time. I think it would be pretty tough for a really
7 good naturalist to keep somebody excited.

8 MR. GASKILL: How about --

9 MS. BURCH: And also, if you get into an
10 hour-long closure, you might want to add that onto nighttime
11 restrictions. I would consider that after I thought group
12 three's discussions led to if you had a two or three or
13 half-day closure you just --

14 MS. PAHL: That's what I'm saying; just get
15 people off the road.

16 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I'm confused now. Are we
17 talking about a stop of a whole hour, or are we talking
18 about four 15-minute stops?

19 MS. PAHL: Well, I think you're talking about
20 maybe two 30-minute stops is an hour, and for two hours you
21 might be talking about two one-hour stops.

22 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Well, I think anything more
23 than a 15-minute stop is too much.

24 MS. PAHL: Well, so do we.

25 CHAIRMAN OGLE: You can have two stops or

1 three stops is all right. But I think any more than 15
2 minutes at a stop is too much for a visitor. They're going
3 to get upset.

4 MR. GASKILL: That's a good way to approach
5 it. What's the maximum amount of time?

6 MS. PAHL: If you take the Jammers over like
7 you used to, you would stop along the way. Maybe not for 15
8 minutes. So maybe you could put those stops with some sort
9 of an interpretive panel or whatever might be going on. But
10 if you keep somebody in their car stopped for 30 minutes
11 more, I think that would be a negative visitor experience.

12 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Tony.

13 MR. JEWETT: We talked about the 15 minute.
14 We also talked, Craig, about the fact that people are coming
15 up and going to their destination at the top of the pass.
16 So that you could have a couple 15-minute stops perhaps on
17 the way up, they stop, they go down the other side, a couple
18 15-minutes stops for a total of an hour. But you probably
19 don't want to put four 15-minute stops on the way up the
20 pass, as an example.

21 MR. GASKILL: Okay.

22 Paul.

23 MR. SLITER: What Barbara said, I think, is
24 what sort of rings true for me in that if we're going to go,
25 let's be able to go. So let's have, you know, intermittent

1 closures, you know, every other day or whatever it might be,
2 nighttime, certain hours during the day. But if you're
3 going to let people be on the road, then let them keep
4 moving, as best you possibly can.

5 MS. PAHL: And I think a caveat to that is no
6 more than a 15-minute whatever stop is, 15 minutes.

7 MR. GASKILL: So how about if we modify this
8 to say up to four 15-minute stops, two on each side -- up to
9 two on each side of the pass, for a total of an hour
10 maximum. Which basically doubles the amount of time that
11 you have for the status quo.

12 MR. O'QUINN: That's right.

13 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Is that okay with the
14 Committee?

15 MS. BURCH: This is just something that we're
16 going to consider; right?

17 MR. GASKILL: It's a way to describe it, if
18 we describe it as a reasonable alternative to consider.

19 CHAIRMAN OGLE: That's an alternate to
20 consider.

21 Dick, you wanted to --

22 MR. GATTEN: I just wanted to interject, over
23 the past several years, we've tried different scenarios for
24 managing traffic. You've basically heard what we're using
25 on the current one. But, you know, the thing to keep in

1 mind as you're talking over these options is, the less time
2 you allow the public to be stopped, the more time it's going
3 to take to complete the construction, you know, in terms of
4 years and more costly.

5 We have found that once you get through this, a
6 combination of things works pretty well. You know, give
7 them more time at certain times of day and that type of
8 thing. So it's just something to keep in the back of your
9 mind. Yeah, during the peak travel time during the day,
10 maybe 15 minutes is tops.

11 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Okay; thanks.

12 MR. GASKILL: Anybody have a problem with
13 that?

14 CHAIRMAN OGLE: We're good on that.

15 MS. PAHL: I guess I would say in response to
16 that, given whatever that piece of road work is at that
17 time, we would rather have you limit access to the road so
18 you can accomplish it than make somebody wait in their car
19 for 30 minutes.

20 MR. GATTEN: And the other thing to recognize
21 is the type of closures has an effect upon the design at a
22 particular site; the type of wall repair, whatever. So it
23 has an effect. And that's why what we choose here to
24 analyze then has a direct effect upon the length of time,
25 the cost and the economic impact of the area.

1 MS. LEWIS: It might help that we're very
2 precise in defining what a delay is in using the definition
3 of the word "delay" consistently throughout all the options.
4 And then what the words "restricted access," how it would be
5 used throughout the document. So going back to the groups
6 asking for consistency in what we mean by the terms we use
7 and how we communicate them. Because what I just heard was
8 I think everybody kind of came together for a minute in
9 thinking about what Barbara's been saying and now Paul, and
10 that is, you don't want people -- you would rather people's
11 access be restricted than to -- from, i.e., even getting up
12 on certain sections of the road, rather than getting them up
13 on the road and delaying them for more than 15 minutes. I
14 mean, that's what I've been hearing.

15 MS. PAHL: At a stop.

16 MS. LEWIS: At a stop. So I'm just thinking
17 it's good how you're going to instruct the consultant. Make
18 sure that the way you define those terms, it's consistent so
19 that it can be communicated.

20 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I think you're right. It
21 seems to me we have consensus on no more than a 15-minute
22 delay at a time and no more than an hour max.

23 But let's talk about Barb's point that as
24 alternatives, Barb's preference is that restricted access be
25 preferred over delayed travel.

1 MS. PAHL: No, a period of that. Longer than
2 like a 30-minute delay as opposed to a 15-minute.

3 CHAIRMAN OGLE: All right. So does everybody
4 agree with that, that we would rather restrict access, have
5 closures and allow more work on the road, rather than extend
6 delays beyond this period of time?

7 MR. JEWETT: Are we talking apples and
8 oranges there? Didn't we deal with restricted access at
9 different opportunities such as nighttime restrictions or
10 seasonal restrictions?

11 MS. PAHL: Right.

12 MR. JEWETT: Aren't those two different
13 discussions, or am I misinterpreting the question?

14 CHAIRMAN OGLE: No, I think that that's
15 probably included in some of these other restrictions that
16 have been talked about by some of the groups.

17 MS. PAHL: I think you're right.

18 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I think you're right. So
19 let's finish going down the list then.

20 Is one-way traffic an option?

21 MR. O'QUINN: There's three concepts.
22 There's one-way traffic where you have to stop traffic in
23 regard to the delays and you're giving the contractor one
24 lane to work with. There's another one-way traffic where
25 maybe from 2:00 to 4:00 you run it east to west and 4:00 to

1 6:00 you run it west to east. There's a third concept of
2 one-way all the way through the Park, and then around with
3 an alternative route like 2 as the cross. So what are we
4 talking about here?

5 MR. GASKILL: Either the second or the third.
6 Because the first one is basically status quo. What we're
7 talking about is an extended length of one-way traffic so
8 you can only drive that direction on that section of the
9 pass for an extended --

10 MR. O'QUINN: I think that's been taken off
11 the board.

12 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I think that was something
13 that our group one wanted -- didn't think should be
14 considered.

15 MR. O'QUINN: Correct.

16 CHAIRMAN OGLE: What's the thoughts on the
17 other groups?

18 MR. MEZNARCH: Group two thought it was okay.

19 MR. BAKER: Well, Barney's solution three
20 here, one-way access all the way, it's a way of spreading
21 out your visitor pressure throughout the Park. And if you
22 had -- if the visitor knew ahead of time that it was going
23 to experience the Going-to-the-Sun highway as one attraction
24 of the Park and would be able to include in other
25 attractions of the area like Many Glacier or down at East

1 Glacier or even at Walton or whatever as part of the visitor
2 experience, you're spreading the pressure of the park. And
3 I think if they were informed far enough ahead and it was in
4 all your printed materials, et cetera, that may work very
5 well. It may also spin off an economic benefit over to the
6 east side. Because you're not going to just be having
7 people going to the top and then coming back down again.
8 You're going to be clearing out -- your traffic congestion
9 on the west side is going to be reduced a little bit coming
10 down, but you're still going to get the same amount of
11 traffic at the west side junction to spread out.

12 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Paul?

13 MR. SLITER: The thing about one-way traffic,
14 maybe if you're going to do a wholesale one-way type of
15 deal, maybe it wouldn't have to be all the time. Maybe
16 you'd do it certain days of the week. But like was said
17 earlier, whatever you do, make it consistent.

18 MR. BROOKE: Group three.

19 MR. SLITER: Group three came up with the
20 consistency idea. Let's give them a hand.

21 MS. PAHL: And I think that would be very
22 difficult, if you were going to reverse it or have two-way
23 part of the time and one-way part of the time. I think that
24 would be very difficult.

25 MS. PAHL: We do that in Colorado all the

1 time because of that Eisenhower Tunnel. And on big weekends
2 of trouble, we have one way going eastbound and one going
3 westbound. And people just know that's the way the deal is,
4 and you make your plans. And people do it.

5 MR. SLITER: I was going to finish what I was
6 going to say. Barney, you had talked about certain times of
7 the day to switch it back and forth. I think that that
8 makes it a nightmare. If you can plan from this day to the
9 next, it's not much different than having to plan that on
10 Tuesday we need to go because Wednesday it's going to be
11 closed. I mean, whatever the process or whatever the
12 schedule is, set it, stick to it, and then live by it until
13 the thing's done.

14 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Sounds like there's several
15 people who at least want to leave that as an alternative to
16 consider and, therefore, we can let the consultant consider
17 it. And if he brings it back, then we can discuss whether
18 or not we want to go with that at that time. Does that seem
19 fair? All right; we'll leave it in for something to
20 consider for now.

21 Will.

22 MR. BROOKE: Just one question to that. Does
23 that get the contractor talking about one-way traffic?
24 Greg, you've eliminated one lane, but you've still got this
25 traffic to deal with, doesn't matter if it's two or one. My

1 bottom line is, does it really get you anywhere, in terms of
2 benefits?

3 MR. GATTEN: We looked at that alternative
4 some before. If you're closing one lane all the time and
5 traffic is allowed to flow in the other lane all day one
6 way, all day the next day the other way, however you want to
7 manage that one lane, if you allow the contractor to have
8 the other one, it does benefit. I mean, they're able to
9 work in more areas.

10 MR. BABB: Materials, everything. They just
11 use the full thing.

12 MR. O'QUINN: The other thing you would be
13 doing is you would basically be eliminating that one-hour
14 delay, because you're going to be maintaining the traffic
15 one direction all the time.

16 MR. GATTEN: That's right.

17 CHAIRMAN OGLE: We'll leave that in as an
18 alternative.

19 MR. O'QUINN: I think, don't we need to
20 clarify that he's talking about two different things there?
21 One is a one-way loop and the other is one-way segments for
22 consideration.

23 MR. GASKILL: I think what we want to look at
24 is a one-way loop so the contractor always knows he has just
25 one-way traffic. The other would be similar. From the

1 contractor's perspective you might run it one way in the
2 morning and the other way in the afternoon, but one section
3 only has one way at a time. That's more complicated to
4 manage from a traffic perspective.

5 MR. O'QUINN: The sense I'm getting, and I
6 think from what Paul said, is that maybe a one-way loop is
7 reasonable but reversing is not.

8 MR. SLITER: Well, I think you can reverse it
9 day-to-day, but don't switch people around in the middle of
10 the day. Because like I said earlier, if you wanted to go
11 in hiking to Hidden Lake and go the rest of the way through,
12 that's one thing. But for people planning their day out, I
13 don't think you can go in one way and then tell them that
14 they've got to come out the same way they went in.

15 MR. GASKILL: I just put down full-day
16 minimum, nothing less than that.

17 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Night restrictions?
18 Tony.

19 MR. JEWETT: I don't have a comment. I just,
20 actually, have a request for Craig. As you pursue one way,
21 you said yesterday that you would probably be able to
22 extrapolate from various data pieces the percentage of
23 people that go to the top and then go back down from the way
24 they came up. I really like the discussion on one way.
25 It's got some interesting things to it. That's a piece of

1 information I'd like to have.

2 MR. GASKILL: That would be a very key piece
3 of information. And one of the questions in the visitor use
4 survey we should be able to get that type of information as
5 well. So that's key information for that.

6 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Restricted traffic at night,
7 full closure, some hours during the night so the contractor
8 can work. I think most every group concurred with that. So
9 leave that one in.

10 Seasonal restrictions, closures of the
11 road -- full closures either after Labor Day or before
12 Memorial Day to give the contractor a work time. I think
13 that was a concept. We didn't have any specifics yet, of
14 course, but as an alternative to consider, does everybody
15 agree with that being left in? I think there's consensus on
16 that one being left in.

17 Managed transit, public transportation, I guess to
18 get people in and out of the Park. I know at least one
19 committee suggested consideration of that, and I think one
20 or two others did not.

21 What's the thoughts on leaving that in as an
22 alternative?

23 MR. BAKER: One of the things that we were
24 talking about on that was, currently, there's a restriction
25 on public transit over the pass because of the

1 concessionaire agreements. And I think if that was looked
2 at a little more closely and expanded into outside areas
3 being able to bring in visitors with like a van or whatever,
4 six cars equal one van, you're going to eliminate a lot of
5 traffic, if you can start encouraging other people to pool
6 their people into smaller transportation units. But right
7 now, that is not -- you cannot really do that. And I think
8 that was one of the things that we looked at.

9 And the other thing was, as Barb was pointing out
10 to our group, using that as a real opportunity to bring
11 groups and tours over. Promote it as going up to see the
12 attraction. So there is a big opportunity there.

13 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Our group one thought that
14 those were more long-range park transportation management
15 issues rather than reconstruction issues.

16 MR. BAKER: Short-term and long-term.
17 Because if -- let's say we were going to do this project
18 with the current restrictions that the concessionaire has
19 built in, we would not be able to do that.

20 CHAIRMAN OGLE: True.

21 MR. O'QUINN: But the point is, as far as the
22 construction of the highway or reconstruction or
23 rehabilitation or whatever, whether you're using transit or
24 not is not going to really affect, too much, the way you'll
25 do it.

1 MR. BAKER: Except for parking, volume of
2 traffic.

3 MS. PAHL: Volume of traffic.

4 MR. O'QUINN: The question is, how much
5 access has the contractor got? And if you've got a fleet of
6 buses coming through, he still does not have full access.

7 MR. BAKER: True. But the thing of it is, at
8 the top of the Logan Pass Visitor Center where there's very
9 restricted parking, if you had some way to alleviate some of
10 that, that's going to help that area up there.

11 MR. O'QUINN: How's it going to affect the
12 contractor?

13 MR. BAKER: Well, it may not help the
14 contractor right there, but it's definitely going to help
15 the volume of traffic on the road.

16 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Why don't you give me a quick
17 show of hands to how many people want to leave it in as an
18 alternative to consider.

19 Well, we only have seven people who want to leave
20 it in as an alternative, so that doesn't get our two-thirds
21 majority.

22 MR. GASKILL: Can I recommend, I think we
23 need to consider it as a transportation alternative,
24 regardless of an engineering alternative. And if it helps
25 out the engineering alternatives, it will show up.

1 MR. SLITER: From a contractor's standpoint,
2 if you cut the traffic load by a third, is that not
3 beneficial?

4 MR. GASKILL: We should ask our contractor,
5 or your experts.

6 MR. GATTEN: I don't think it changes
7 anything.

8 MR. SLITER: You don't think it changes
9 anything? Okay.

10 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Tom, you had your hand up and
11 down and up.

12 MR. MCDONALD: It appears in order to achieve
13 our 15-minute delay on a visitor, that allowing mass transit
14 up there will help reach that goal. It just goes hand in
15 hand, as far as I'm concerned. If you didn't have a mass
16 transit opportunity, you're going to have a larger platoon
17 of cars waiting at that flag man intersection. And if you
18 have mass transit, that helps achieve that 15-minute goal.

19 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Bill?

20 MR. DAKIN: I would like to see it included
21 just as one way of dovetailing with all these other factors
22 of allowing people to still have certain uses of the Logan
23 Pass area. Go up to Hidden Lake and be assured that you can
24 get back down in the afternoon, whether the traffic
25 is -- you know, no matter what the restrictions. I think it

1 allows people to still use that area of the Park which they
2 might not do if they didn't have an assured way in and out.

3 CHAIRMAN OGLE: David.

4 MR. JACKSON: I think that there's some
5 possibility that would be useful for hikers, and then the
6 parking areas up there that the hikers currently use could
7 be used by machines and storing stuff and stuff like that.
8 So I think that it ought to be given some consideration
9 in -- as an alternative, particularly in the transportation
10 of pedestrians to the various trail heads and whatnot.

11 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Looks to me like some people
12 are kind of shifting gears, so why don't we leave in as an
13 alternative for the consultant to consider.

14 MR. O'QUINN: I don't think anybody has said
15 we would not use any mass transit. And it's not either/or;
16 it's a mix. And using it, does that have anything to do
17 with the traffic management? It may be good from an overall
18 transportation plan, but I don't think it has anything to do
19 with traffic management and construction.

20 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Barb.

21 MS. PAHL: I think the way to use it here is
22 it will help facilitate to improve visitor experience. We
23 get to the factors we use, cost and so forth. But the other
24 one was the visitor experience. We talked about the
25 educational component. If you have people in where there's

1 a red bus or some other mass transit vehicle and now you
2 have these three or two 15-minute stops, you've got the
3 person in that vehicle who can provide that interpretation
4 to make that 15 minutes part of the deal. So as people are
5 still trying to get their auto nature trail, if you will,
6 Going-to-the-Sun highway, it will help facilitate that if
7 they're in that kind of vehicle.

8 CHAIRMAN OGLE: All right; I think we'll
9 leave it in for an alternative to consider.

10 What is this one?

11 MR. GASKILL: Restrict one side, that would
12 be.

13 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Closure on one side.

14 MR. GASKILL: We might say closure, but we
15 might close a section of one side of the pass to give the
16 contractor the entire road for a specified amount of time.
17 It might be a summer, it might be a season, it might be two
18 seasons. So they can get that entire section done. That's
19 kind of what this is.

20 CHAIRMAN OGLE: You're talking about the
21 summer season.

22 MR. GASKILL: Summer season; right.

23 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I think the groups have said
24 they don't want full closure for a whole season. Group one
25 certainly did. Was there any group who thought full closure

1 for a whole season would be considered?

2 MR. BROOKE: Anybody who has the courage to,
3 stand up.

4 MS. BURCH: No, this is access to Logan Pass.

5 MR. GASKILL: This basically is access to a
6 piece of the road. You still have access to the pass at all
7 times.

8 MS. BURCH: I would be up to consider that.

9 MS. PAHL: We assumed it would be the west
10 side because that seemed to be a place where you had a lot
11 of work to do and it's kind of a difficult setting.

12 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I think what group one said
13 is that they would like to have the data and the comparisons
14 of cost and time as a baseline, but really didn't think that
15 that was a very feasible option.

16 So I guess in terms of having that data, keep it
17 in the mix. Is that fair? All right.

18 MR. GASKILL: Obviously, combination of above
19 works and closure does not.

20 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Right. Do you want to go
21 through these other lists?

22 MR. BABB: Wait; I have a question. I'm
23 sorry on that. It has to do with closure. You're not going
24 to consider closure at all as a comparison or anything else?
25 In regards to socioeconomic, from a construction standpoint,

1 when we brainstormed a long time ago, that was construction
2 now, not visitor use or economics. That came out far
3 superior in regards to dollars and cents and time and
4 everything. And even though that may be not what the
5 Committee wants, to me, you still should be looking at that
6 for comparison and data.

7 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Anna Marie.

8 MS. MOE: That's kind of what we discussed in
9 group three, too, was that we didn't like the option, but we
10 thought we should have it at least as a benchmark to look
11 at. And we factored in the other things like socioeconomic
12 that it was probably going to fall out. At least it was my
13 contention that we needed it for a benchmark.

14 CHAIRMAN OGLE: And I think that's what group
15 one said, too, is that the data we would like to have but we
16 weren't too thrilled about it as likely options. So I
17 suppose, in terms of baseline and data and benchmarking,
18 we'd like to have the information.

19 MR. JEWETT: Randy, before we move on, I just
20 want to -- as I look at that list, everything's got a check
21 on it with the exception of no action. And I want to make
22 sure that, Craig, MK doesn't -- MK captured the richness of
23 this discussion in terms of qualifying and adding dimensions
24 to each one of those categories in its discussion, so it
25 doesn't look like we haven't really done anything. Because

1 I think that we've provided parameters, as you look at each
2 one of those, and they're real important in terms of giving
3 you direction as you put your alternatives together.

4 In other words, closure's still up there, but it's
5 up there for a reason.

6 MR. GASKILL: It's only up there for a
7 baseline data only.

8 MR. JEWETT: Exactly. I just want to make
9 sure that's clear, even though each one of them is checked.

10 MR. GASKILL: And we thought it was better to
11 restrict access than to delay excessively the minutes. And
12 we have our access restrictions and our seasonal
13 restrictions. In terms of one-way traffic, we'll have that
14 limited to no more than -- no less than one day, one way at
15 a time. We talked about what an acceptable delay was. And
16 we talked about the mass transit. There was quite a bit of
17 discussion about managed transit; that that really was an
18 opportunity for visitor use opportunities and transportation
19 experience and may provide some benefit to the construction
20 alternative, but that's really not the primary reason we're
21 leaving that in there.

22 MR. JEWETT: I'm sorry; you don't have to
23 revise it then. I guess I would say the minutes will
24 reflect the discussion. I think we should look at the
25 minutes as we go through.

1 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I think we should go through
2 these other lists, though, and pick out items that aren't on
3 his list that we want to make sure are considered.

4 MR. DAKIN: Didn't we want to specifically
5 include the wisdom from group three about the possibility
6 that there would be a routine, predictable, consistent
7 one-day closure a week, if that turned out to be useful?

8 MR. O'QUINN: That's in addition. That's not
9 the base list.

10 MR. DAKIN: It would be part of the closure
11 thing or a part of the restrictions. But I assume we wanted
12 to make sure and included that.

13 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I think we're going to go
14 through each list. So let's run down these things.

15 MR. O'QUINN: Randy, before we get off that,
16 for the same reason we were talking about leaving closure
17 and restricted east and west side on, I think you need to
18 leave no action on as a baseline information for if you
19 don't do anything, what's going to happen. That's part of
20 your purpose and need that's going to come out of this
21 thing.

22 MR. GASKILL: For the NEPA process, you need
23 to have the no-action alternative. But we're just talking
24 about what your recommendations are.

25 MR. O'QUINN: I mean, that is going to have

1 to be addressed at some point.

2 MR. BABB: My question, Barney, on that is
3 how we define the difference between no action and status
4 quo? Because after the money that we have right now for
5 Going-to-the-Sun Road, there, in essence, is no more money
6 that we have for Going-to-the-Sun Road.

7 MS. PAHL: My understanding of the status quo
8 was the construction procedures and traffic management
9 you're operating with now. That's what I thought you meant
10 by "status quo." No action would be after that's over and
11 nothing's happened.

12 MR. BABB: Okay. But that's, in essence,
13 when's going to happen. Because as of now, there's no more
14 money. So after we finish those two contracts, nothing
15 further is going to happen, unless something changed.

16 MR. BROOKE: We're not talking about these in
17 the light of your budget constraints, I don't think.

18 MR. BABB: Okay.

19 MR. O'QUINN: But no action would be doing
20 nothing beyond the management -- I mean, the contract you've
21 got going now. In my opinion -- my understanding of status
22 quo would be for any additional work would be done under the
23 restrictions you're operating under now. That was my
24 understanding. And status quo is really not a traffic
25 management option. It's a baseline information.

1 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Let's see how much progress
2 we can make at going through the list and see what can be
3 added that we haven't covered that we want the consultant to
4 consider.

5 So let's just start with group two's list here. I
6 don't know what that public xport -- what is that one?
7 Where's group two spokesman? Paul.

8 Paul, what is that public xport thing?

9 MR. SLITER: Xport is an abbreviation for
10 transportation.

11 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Public transportation?

12 MR. SLITER: Yes.

13 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Oh, we've already got that
14 in. One-way traffic; that's in. Seasonal closures; that's
15 in. One-side restriction; that's in.

16 MR. GASKILL: And then factors.

17 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Okay.

18 Let's go to the next one. Pedestrians/bicycle.
19 Yeah, I think we should add that.

20 MR. BROOKE: It was -- it's not right to say
21 pedestrians/bicycle. As it evolved it was other vehicular
22 transport and pedestrian, I guess. So, you know,
23 motorcycle --

24 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Motorcycle and smaller
25 vehicles.

1 MR. BROOKE: -- other traffic.

2 CHAIRMAN OGLE: One-hour maximum; in there.
3 One-day-a-week closure? We may as well have that for
4 consideration, huh? Closure one day per week.

5 MR. SLITER: Thanks to the vast wisdom of
6 group three.

7 Consistency; that's on there.

8 MR. GASKILL: The present fix; that's
9 automatic.

10 CHAIRMAN OGLE: That's automatic. We've
11 dealt with those.

12 So let's go to the first one. Shoulder season
13 access is in there. One-lane access is in there. Nighttime
14 closure is in there. Managed transit is in. Restrict one
15 side is in. I think we're there.

16 MR. GASKILL: Okay.

17 CHAIRMAN OGLE: So does that give the
18 consultants a list of factors and alternatives to consider
19 from the Committee that you can go forward with?

20 MR. GASKILL: That will help us with some
21 parameters and what you think's appropriate.

22 CHAIRMAN OGLE: David.

23 MR. JACKSON: There's one near the third
24 group that I'll bring up because I thought it up, and that
25 was the impact involved on length of stay. And there's all

1 kinds of data on how many people come in the Park. But the
2 road's maintenance closures could severely change how long
3 people stay, and that will severely impact utilization of
4 tourism facilities around the Park and in the Park. So if
5 the average stay is four days and it kicks to three, you'll
6 have a 25 percent reduction demand for visitor facilities.

7 MR. BAKER: Alternatively, you could take
8 that same aspect that you just said, and if we spread them
9 throughout the Park, you're right. Maybe their length of
10 stay would increase.

11 MR. JACKSON: That's correct; absolutely. So
12 I mean, that's a thing to focus on, length of stay.

13 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Craig, do you also want to
14 see what consensus there is amongst the groups on those
15 factors to consider or not?

16 MR. GASKILL: The factors to consider would
17 be good information for us to have, although I know I
18 recognize the length of time we have is kind of limited.
19 The reason the factors are more is because it gives us some
20 priority of what area we should be concentrating to give you
21 the right information.

22 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Well, I think we can do that
23 pretty quickly. Why don't we just look at the factors part
24 of each list.

25 MR. GASKILL: Okay.

1 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Long-term benefits, visitor
2 experience; yes.

3 MR. SLITER: Offerings.

4 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Offerings of services.

5 MS. PAHL: That's part of the long-term
6 benefits idea that, you know, as people create other tourism
7 products, take advantage of the people that maybe aren't
8 coming out the east side. That was a long-term benefit
9 because thousands of tourism opportunities could exist after
10 the road is fixed.

11 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Anybody disagreeing with that
12 as being a factor for the consultant to consider? All
13 right; it's in. Cost of construction; that's in.
14 Mitigation; that's in. Future maintenance plans and
15 funding. I think that was a consensus on that one.
16 Weather.

17 MR. SLITER: Planning based on averages.

18 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I think that that's in.
19 That's it. Economic impacts is in. Completion of economic
20 impact, time to complete construction, visitor experience.

21 MR. GASKILL: Visitor experience. The part I
22 liked about this, and again I'm giving kudos to group three,
23 was because they defined what they meant by "visitor
24 experience." So visitor experience we have down we should
25 mention, measure delays. We should measure what facilities,

1 education, entertainment opportunities are, opportunities to
2 see Going-to-the-Sun Road, impacts, length of stay use,
3 efficient savings. I guess this is a different one.

4 CHAIRMAN OGLE: That education and
5 entertainment, is that during delays or alternatives or what
6 is that? Group three?

7 MR. BROOKE: It's both. It's prior to and at
8 the site.

9 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Put that up there as a factor
10 to consider.

11 MR. GASKILL: Going-to-the-Sun Road, impacts
12 on length of stay and use.

13 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Yeah.

14 MR. GASKILL: Cost.

15 MS. PAHL: Cost benefit.

16 MR. GASKILL: Efficient savings short-term
17 cost or adding dollars, up-front incentive.

18 MS. MOE: That was the Great Falls/Kalispell.

19 MR. GASKILL: Looking at total cost of
20 mitigation.

21 Contractor experience?

22 MR. BAKER: Definitely.

23 MS. MOE: Probably management incentives.

24 MR. BROOKE: Things to consider when
25 you're --

1 MR. SLITER: A contractor with experience.

2 MR. GASKILL: -- contractor with experience.

3 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Visitor safety; that's in.

4 All right. We're running a little behind here, so
5 why don't we go ahead with the public comment period and
6 then we can come and wrap up on this after the public
7 comment period to make sure the consultant has all the
8 factors we want him to consider.

9 This is the time set for our public comment period
10 on our agenda, and we have two people who have signed up
11 requesting to address the Committee. First person I have is
12 George Gallagher. Is George here?

13 George.

14 MR. GALLAGHER: Yes; thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Identify yourself and who you
16 represent, if anyone, please.

17 MR. GALLAGHER: George Gallagher. I live in
18 Great Falls, and I represent myself. I wrote these down. I
19 don't know whether they distributed copies or not. Probably
20 not, so you better keep notes.

21 CHAIRMAN OGLE: If you have something you
22 want to submit to us to make part of the record, we will
23 certainly accept that, if you have something written down.

24 MR. GALLAGHER: Okay. I'm just going to read
25 it, if you will bear with me. "From my point of view, in

1 restoring the Sun Road, we should alter nothing, no curve or
2 grade or roadway structure that is not essential to
3 restoring the integrity of the road. That is not to
4 preclude some alteration of cross slope, as suggested by
5 MK Centennial. The charge in many cases will be to marry
6 old world technology," which is what exists there, "with
7 modern techniques to achieve an even better structure than
8 original yet they look alike. There should be no sacrifice
9 in quality for any reason. Every day, instead of saying
10 'good morning,' we will say 'How's the drainage'; the
11 engineers agree drainage is the single largest major problem
12 area to address. When we get done, if it were possible to
13 compare our results with those of 1933, they would be
14 indistinguishable. To achieve that goal will require top
15 quality engineering, top quality judgment calls where
16 mathematical solutions don't provide complete answers, top
17 quality peer review, top quality owner decisions, and, last
18 but not least, money.

19 "I haven't heard that this group is charged with
20 any funding responsibilities. The Park Service cannot lobby
21 for money. And according to statements made yesterday, the
22 project is already in money trouble. Lack of money will
23 likely become more acute with time and plague this project
24 for its entirety. It will result in delays, longer times
25 for construction, and increase costs, some of the very

1 things the Committee is concerned about. So, who on the team
2 is working on funding? The answer is likely nobody, at
3 least not with the intensity to get it. That is a big
4 weakness in the whole process. If this Committee wants to
5 make a great contribution to the project, include in your
6 recommendations ideas for or at least the need for a means
7 of securing funding.

8 "I have seen how projects can wallow when you have
9 to phase work to fit funds, not knowing when or if the next
10 phase will be funded. It is a poor approach to
11 rehabilitating what has become a national shrine. There are
12 likely millions of 'Sun Road worshipers' who would support
13 what we are doing - how do we get the word out?"

14 In addition to what I've written here, I listened
15 to part of your conversation, anyway, about road closures.
16 And I know you're all aware of this, but a very big factor
17 in whether we do or do not or the nature of the road
18 closures is cost. Road closures in a highway or road, let's
19 not use the word "highway" with a 40 or 50-foot
20 right-of-way would be difficult enough. We have about a
21 20-foot right-of-way on this road. Almost impossible for
22 construction to be going on while there's traffic going
23 through.

24 I don't know the full scope of the work, nor do I
25 think anybody else does at this point in time. But I could

1 guess that easily providing road closures during
2 construction could double the cost of this job. And going
3 back to what I said here about money, someone is going to be
4 taking a hard look at what this job costs. And if it's
5 escalated substantially because of road closures, we better
6 have a pretty good reason for it. I think the cost of road
7 closures ought to be specifically identified in the cost
8 estimates for this job. And I don't think that's included
9 in these folks' scope yet. But at some point in time,
10 whoever does the cost estimate, should do that. Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Thank you, Mr. Gallagher.

12 Is there a question of Mr. Gallagher?

13 Paul.

14 MR. SLITER: Mr. Gallagher, I just wanted to
15 thank you. You said that the cost of the project will
16 increase with road closures. Do you mean in terms of
17 economic impact, or are you saying that the road -- it will
18 be cheaper if we use road closures?

19 MR. GALLAGHER: I was looking strictly at the
20 cost of construction, planning and construction.

21 MR. SLITER: And I may have misunderstood
22 you. But you said that -- did you say that road closures
23 are going to be vital to keeping the cost down or that
24 closures will escalate the cost?

25 MR. GALLAGHER: Closures will escalate the

1 cost.

2 MR. SLITER: Could you explain how that is
3 true?

4 MR. GALLAGHER: Well, the contractor tears up
5 a section of road, for whatever purpose. Maybe there's a
6 drainage structure to be replaced. And he gets to a certain
7 point and it's time to open the road. He's probably going
8 to have to make some temporary backfill of that spot in
9 order to let the traffic through. Plus, the fact he has to
10 keep it safe and all those kinds of things. And it's quite
11 a disruption -- you know, if the contractor has a ten-foot
12 hole to dig, it's almost impossible for him to do that
13 unless he gets pretty inventive in how he does the project.
14 You've got to consider the amount of right-of-way there that
15 you have to work with. There's no room to detour around.
16 There's no detours on the Sun Road. Thank you. Does that
17 answer your question?

18 MR. SLITER: No. I'm sorry; I'm -- I would
19 think that for a contractor to be able to work on a road
20 where there was no traffic would be less costly to the
21 contractor or to the project than if the traffic were
22 allowed to continue as the work was being done. And you
23 seem to be saying the opposite.

24 MR. GALLAGHER: No; I'm sorry. That's
25 precisely what I intended to say --

1 MR. SLITER: Thank you.

2 MR. GALLAGHER: -- if I said differently.

3 MR. SLITER: Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Thank you, Mr. Gallagher.

5 The next person who has signed up to address the
6 Committee is Sharlon Willows.

7 MS. WILLOWS: I'm Sharlon Willows. I'm a
8 certified legal assistant in administrative law and also the
9 coordinator for Canyon Preservation.

10 Today I'd like to put more emphasis on a need to
11 organize the engineering survey based on NEPA categories to
12 facilitate and expedite NEPA work on Going-to-the-Sun Road.
13 That is a need for NEPA staging so to speak. We could wait
14 forever for an EIS, which is a form of no action.

15 Representative Hill's legislation for the
16 engineering study clearly stated the funds will be used for
17 assessing the best available technology to reduce costs and
18 mitigate impacts. And I hope we keep our sights on that.
19 Hopefully, this process is focusing on accomplishing that
20 mandate applicable not only to the NEPA process but to
21 preserving the historic site and historic landmark. And
22 hopefully this process will mitigate, quote, "much damage
23 (to upper walls) caused because of snowplow maintenance
24 practices," end quote, addressed by MKC yesterday. This is
25 a major impact and must not continue the intentional harm.

1 I'm going to address NEPA triggers.

2 Yesterday, MKC stated there are substantial areas
3 where minor work is necessary. These are FONSI. That is
4 finding of no significant impact, and do not necessarily
5 require an EIS. Based on NEPA regs, this process is totally
6 amiss by including large amounts of FONSI maintenance such
7 as repointing, cleaning and repairs of drains into a big EIS
8 process. EIS is for major federal action with significant
9 environmental impact, most applicable to the "exceptions
10 that require more extensive repair." Where exactly are the
11 extensive repair sites that should be detailed in an EIS?
12 And what exactly is the justification at these sites for the
13 extensive repair? And what are their milepoint locations?
14 And what is the "best available technology to reduce costs
15 and mitigate impacts" to the historic site and landmark
16 resources? I believe even some extensive repairs, per se,
17 could be targeted with an EA, a complete EA tiered off of
18 the GMP final EIS to facilitate final work and funding.

19 Yesterday, quote, "scaling back the mountain" was
20 presented, inappropriately, I believe, as a reasonable
21 alternative. Yet it would be an obvious adverse effect
22 under Section 106 under the Historic Preservation Act. The
23 CCP imposes wasting time and money on such a radical,
24 unnecessary alternative, the same as MDOT is proposing to
25 "blow up" sites eligible for the National Historic Society

1 at Bad Rock Canyon without even considering a preservation
2 alternative. Scaling is a radical impact to the historic
3 configuration. Where is the data to show it's really
4 needed? If there are rocks falling on the road on Highline
5 trail, put some tasteful mesh fence up there. And, again,
6 let's not lose sight of the funding directive for "best
7 available technology to reduce costs and mitigate impacts."

8 And how can costs be reduced? I believe by
9 sorting out the maintenance problems and environmental
10 assessment/FONSI repairs which MKC admits are, quote,
11 "substantial." The substantial areas where minor work is
12 necessary should be itemized and separated, I believe, in
13 the engineering study and then could be plugged into an EA.
14 Glacier Park already has a "boilerplate" EA from the 1999
15 repairs where the minor work could immediately be "plugged
16 into" another EA/FONSI with minimal amount of staff work.
17 Then funding could proceed to continue work outside of a big
18 EIS.

19 And also, the idea of EAs tiered to the GM, I
20 think these big EISs can be very problematic and time
21 consuming. Let's focus on site-specific areas (using
22 milepoint locators) pinpointing exceptional areas where more
23 specific and extensive repairs are justified. Then, what
24 exactly are the cost effective historic design options (or
25 "best available technology") consistent with Section 106 and

1 section 110(e) of the Historic Preservation Act? Two
2 separate designations.

3 In conclusion, I believe the EIS and the
4 engineering study behind it should focus on low impact
5 historically compatible design options for the sites that
6 really need extensive repair. A separate EA could
7 immediately be "plugged in" for the substantial minor
8 repairs and maintenance so funding can proceed. Meanwhile,
9 recommendations are needed by next spring to mitigate new
10 and more potential damage being done by snowplowing
11 practices. Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Thank you. Any questions for
13 Ms. Willows?

14 Brian.

15 MR. BAKER: I have a question. I'm not quite
16 sure I captured all that. But if you could synthesize maybe
17 for me, because I'm not an expert at this, what you just
18 said in like maybe a couple sentences. Like what's your
19 point?

20 MR. BROOKE: The point is, for instance, just
21 substantial areas where minor work is needed, boom, that's
22 in one pile in the engineering study. That stuff doesn't
23 have to be in an EIS. That could be plugged into -- the
24 Park already has a boilerplate EA for the '99 repairs. Just
25 plug that in, boom, you'd have your NEPA document compliance

1 work done, ready for some funding. Different groups could
2 pressure Baucus and get rolling on this stuff. Why put all
3 this FONSI material, the substantial FONSI material, into a
4 big EIS unnecessarily? That's just delay -- unnecessary
5 delay on continued work.

6 And I guess that's my point. Is to -- is to
7 organize -- I think if that engineering survey organized the
8 work more or less based on NEPA regs and NEPA categories for
9 the amount of analysis needed for different categories of
10 work, this thing could roll along a little bit faster and
11 not wait for this grandiose EIS to materialize sometime in
12 the future.

13 MR. BAKER: Thank you.

14 MS. WILLOW: Did that help?

15 MR. BAKER: No, but that was all right.

16 MR. O'QUINN: Can I ask a question? The
17 concept, I agree with you. But the slippery slope you get
18 on is segmentation.

19 MS. WILLOWS: The piecemealing, you mean.

20 MR. O'QUINN: Piecemealing or segmenting the
21 project; exactly. I agree with you, there are aspects of it
22 that can be done.

23 And a question of the Park Service, is not the
24 General Management Plan an EIS?

25 MR. BABB: Yes.

1 MR. O'QUINN: So it's a first tier that you
2 can operate off of there. So you can adjust a '99 EA/FONSI
3 that you did for the temporary work -- or not the emergency
4 work. You can operate off the General Management Plan for
5 either Cat Ex work or EA/FONSI work or additional work. But
6 again, the only thing you have to be really, really careful
7 about is you get caught into a piecemeal situation.

8 MS. WILLOWS: But in a way, it's not
9 piecemealing if you're categorizing, I believe, the types of
10 work. Piecemealing, I believe, is usually you're taking one
11 little segment of a highway and doing that and then another
12 segment without the total cumulative.

13 MR. O'QUINN: For the most part, that's
14 correct. For example, the maintenance work that we're
15 talking about and cleaning out the culverts, I don't think
16 you even need -- that's categorically excluded without any
17 further work. We just do it.

18 MS. WILLOWS: I believe so too. Seems to me
19 there's Cat Ex stuff here and EA/FONSI stuff with already a
20 boilerplate on the computer that it seems to me the Park
21 staff could just start plugging another seven to ten million
22 dollars of repair work into and, boom, you'd have a
23 compliance document and then, boom, everybody could start
24 pressuring Baucus or whomever and get this thing rolling,
25 instead of waiting for this big scene from Congress for an

1 EIS that takes forever with stuff included in there that
2 doesn't need to be included there under the law.

3 MR. O'QUINN: All right; another question
4 from a different direction. You were talking about the
5 scaling we were talking about or was given as an example as
6 a remedy for rock fall. And you seem to be very concerned
7 about that as being in violation of what?

8 MR. BROOKE: Well, I would say that
9 it -- you'd have some problems with adverse effect under
10 Section 106. And I think you'd need some geologic
11 examination there because it's a very flaky mountain.

12 MR. O'QUINN: That's why you need to do it,
13 because it is flaky.

14 MS. WILLOWS: Right. But is there actually
15 that much rock fall problem? All I'm saying is, if you're
16 going to do something that radical, you're going to really
17 be getting into the EIS process there. And the Section 106
18 under historic preservation is really supposed to be
19 integrated. So you're looking at trying to justify spending
20 a whole lot of money to justify an adverse effect, if
21 you're, in fact, going to go for that radical kind of
22 scaling back the mountain, scaling back Highline trail, that
23 type of thing. Is it really justified? And is it really an
24 appropriate technology for a historic site and historic
25 landmark? I guess that's my point.

1 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Thank you, Sharlon.

2 All right; is there anyone else who wishes to give
3 public input to the Committee at this time? If not, we will
4 adjourn for our lunch break.

5 Wait. The purpose for each group, Fred.

6 MR. BABB: MK and myself got together last
7 night, and we brainstormed a little bit about the permanent
8 work groups or subcommittee groups.

9 And we had a feeling that those groups might want
10 to get together sometime today for a short period of time
11 and discuss it. So we wrote up one as their purpose and a
12 suggestion what we might do like over lunch or sometime like
13 that if we have a few minutes. We wrote down that the
14 purpose of these subgroups is merely looking at a way to
15 engage or involve the Committee in providing input into the
16 preparation of these technical documents, technical studies
17 that we're doing. And we really wanted a collaborative
18 effort between the Park Service, MK Centennial and, of
19 course, the Committee. But at the same time, we want to
20 give MK Centennial enough flexibility to do their
21 independent analysis.

22 So what we have, we view the Committee work or the
23 subcommittee work groups as a resource that can provide
24 input into MK Centennial's work, from a technical
25 standpoint, and improve the dialogue and the input on these

1 studies because, obviously, we're only meeting every fifth
2 or sixth month so to speak. So we want to get a dialogue
3 going on. And so we thought it might be a good idea, over
4 lunch, as treat it a little bit as a working lunch, where
5 those committees might get together with the representative
6 that we've sort of laid out from MK Centennial and in some
7 cases the National Park Service, and just do two things.
8 One is to select a lead for the committee or what we're
9 calling a committee chairperson, and then talk about, from
10 their committee standpoint, how would the best way to then
11 gauge, over the next months up until April or May when we
12 have our meeting, how can we get more dialogue going on
13 those four subjects. And take a few minutes to discuss
14 that. And then on this list, we've said like in
15 transportation/visitor use, we said MK Centennial's contact
16 would be Craig, and the Park Service contact would be
17 myself. Under socioeconomic, the Park Service doesn't
18 really have, at least at Glacier, an expert in that field.
19 So we thought we'd go with one contact, and that would be
20 Jean Townsend, representing both entities.

21 Under public participation that's really not in MK
22 Centennial's contract right now, and that primary
23 responsibility rests with the Park Service as well as the
24 Committee. So there wouldn't be an MK Centennial person on
25 that group, and Mary Riddle would be our contact. And then

1 the last one, engineering, it would ultimately be Jay
2 Brasher. So Kay would be substituting for Jay, and we would
3 have Dick Gatten in regards to our engineering expert. And
4 then get together for ten or 15 minutes, or whatever time we
5 had, and just sort of brainstorm a little bit and talk about
6 how we want to interface over the next six months or so.
7 That's our suggestion, what we wrote up.

8 And Craig sort of wrote down the purpose that we
9 talked about, because the machine isn't working very well
10 right now, so we couldn't Xerox the typed version.

11 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Tony. Did you have a
12 question?

13 MR. JEWETT: Yeah. I'm glad we're having
14 this discussion. Because for the purposes of just
15 clarifying my home nights, something that's been nagging at
16 me for a couple of weeks is some confusion I have over
17 documents that I've been given. My interest in -- I'm going
18 to be on the transportation/visitor committee. And you've
19 got the draft scoping agreement here on that that has a
20 section on that. I've got a September 9 briefing paper and
21 then an MK Centennial -- it looks like a talking sheet. In
22 any case, as I've worked through those, I continue to be
23 confused by the terms "short-term" "long-term" plan. And my
24 confusion is this: Is that are we expected, as a group, to
25 discuss Park long-term transportation plan which is a

1 product that is an output that the National Park Service
2 generates in parks across the country in dealing with the
3 long-term transportation systems? Or is our discussion
4 confined to the rehabilitation of this road and the
5 transportation and traffic systems that are going to be
6 designed or alternatives that will be designed for just
7 that?

8 MR. BABB: It's a combination of both of
9 those that you just said. The short-term relates more or
10 less the way we've written up during construction, and the
11 long-term, then, is how do we phase from that into the
12 long-term transportation/visitor use after the road is
13 rehabilitated. But that's -- I mean, that's a real good
14 question, because that's what we would then have the
15 dialogue in that transportation group to clarify any of
16 those points and then decide about how to go about working
17 on that topic.

18 MR. JEWETT: So we are expected to draw these
19 things about -- we had a little mini discussion -- and
20 depending on how it affects rehabilitation.

21 MS. LEWIS: You think something else maybe
22 that would help clarify this is, again, going back to your
23 original charter and legislation which sort of gives you a
24 sort of primary direction to put forth a series of
25 recommendations to the Secretary of the Interior on how to

1 rehabilitate the Going-to-the-Sun Road. If, in order to put
2 forth your best set of recommendations there's a necessity
3 for discussion on other topics, then so be it. But keeping
4 in mind the primary is to get towards your set of
5 recommendations. So it doesn't -- that's your mission.
6 That's the product that the group must produce. Anything
7 else that occurs in accordance with it is brought into it.
8 But I think, again, it's all back to what your primary
9 product is that you're charged to give.

10 MR. JEWETT: That, to me, is short-term.

11 MR. BABB: There's -- I'm sorry, go ahead.

12 MS. BURCH: Well, that's one reason why I
13 really do want to be on this committee, because there are
14 two parts. That's a whole separate part of the GMP is that
15 long-term. And I think we should directly address what our
16 specific -- our Advisory Committee goal is. And that's just
17 like Tony said, short-term. We have a really specific. And
18 I think that when we start discussing systems that may
19 ultimately play out to long-term, we can very clearly say
20 Here's the setup that we're handing off to somebody else
21 who's going to deal with this as a whole separate issue of
22 the GMP.

23 MR. BABB: That's a good point. The only
24 thing that compounds it is, we have separate funding for
25 transportation/visitor use. So though we have the mission,

1 like Suzann mentioned, our contract with MK is much more
2 than that. So that's why I was saying that that's a good
3 topic. Because how do we filter those two things out,
4 recognizing the focus is on the rehabilitation of the road?

5 MR. JEWETT: I don't want to drag this
6 discussion out too far into lunch, but that's the key point.
7 You have a separate funding component, and the definition is
8 long-term. That says to me that you're looking at this
9 exercise -- the Park is looking at this exercise as a mini
10 scoping phase to look at long-term transportation
11 prerogatives. And if that's the case, that redefines what
12 our discussion is. And I need to know that.

13 MR. BABB: Okay; point well taken.

14 CHAIRMAN OGLE: So you want to have the
15 transportation group meet over there where Tony and Susie
16 are? And then socioeconomic, that's Linda, Brian, David,
17 Don White and Jayne, maybe over here in the middle table.
18 And the engineering group, why don't you find Barney and let
19 him lead that group up. And the public participation group
20 will meet down at this end. That is Paul, me and Lowell.
21 Everybody know what groups you're in?

22 (Proceedings in recess from 12:35 p.m. to
23 1:40 p.m.)

24

25

1 Chairman Ogle calls the meeting to order after the
2 lunch break. He asks the Committee to look over the summary
3 that has been printed off by Dayna and Mary and make sure
4 that the responses are correct.

5 Chairman Ogle then continues with discussion from
6 the morning session of Committee consolidation and
7 concurrence of work group recommendations. He starts by
8 reading the number three question. "If you had two \$50,000
9 pots of money; one was for short-term engineering needs and
10 the other was for the socioeconomic purpose of stimulating
11 local and regional growth, how would you spend these?"

12 MR. GASKILL: For example, the Loop. One of
13 the reasons the Loop was such a high priority was it has
14 such a potential of collapsing without fixing it.

15 CHAIRMAN OGLE: All right; any comments,
16 thoughts, objections to those?

17 MR. GASKILL: I don't know if you want to
18 bring this up. It might be nice to have a priority on these
19 particular items, the engineering items, the socioeconomic
20 items. Would that be helpful for the Park?

21 MS. PAHL: I think what you're going to get
22 is the two ones are whether you start with the maintenance
23 issues, we referred to as clean the gutters, or whether you
24 start with addressing aspects of the road that will fail
25 and, therefore, potentially life safety. And those are the

1 two. What's one and what's two. It's maintenance and --

2 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Maintenance and cleaning
3 culverts was on this one.

4 MS. PAHL: I think those are the two. What
5 comes first, clean the gutters or address the aspects of the
6 road, structurally, that may fail.

7 MR. SLITER: We're talking about drainage in
8 general.

9 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Part of the thing in our
10 group was 50,000 bucks was such a small amount of money, we
11 didn't think you could do much on the road. That's why we
12 came up with the maintenance idea. So that was part of the
13 thinking of group one.

14 MR. GASKILL: We have maintenance as one
15 idea. The addressing life-threatening factors if there's
16 something --

17 MS. PAHL: For 50,000, would allow you to
18 say --

19 MR. GASKILL: It might be 50, it might be 25,
20 it might be a hundred. But it's something you can't do for
21 free.

22 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I think all of that covers
23 maintenance.

24 MS. PAHL: You have to go back to your own
25 instruction and decide. Was 50,000 real or were you trying

1 to get to priorities?

2 MR. GASKILL: That was trying to get to
3 priorities for something that might be reasonable as a
4 low-cost improvement.

5 MS. PAHL: So you want us to take the money
6 thing off and say What comes first; catastrophic loss or
7 life saving, that sort of thing.

8 MR. GASKILL: If you put it that way, I think
9 you have to answer it as a life-safety issue. But if you
10 were to prioritize an engineering recommendation, I guess
11 what I'm hearing, it would be a maintenance -- you could do
12 some preventative maintenance short-term, if you could find
13 that, because that needs to be done. If there's a
14 life-threatening improvement, obviously that needs to be
15 done.

16 MS. PAHL: There you go.

17 CHAIRMAN OGLE: That goes without saying.

18 MR. GASKILL: Because there were other
19 engineering alternatives which might have been Well, we need
20 to study some of the specific areas to see if they're life
21 threatening, or we need to do more core drills to get a
22 better feeling of what the total cost is going to be. We
23 need better mapping so we can get better engineering
24 alternatives. I think the maintenance is what came out of
25 this; okay.

1 So under the socioeconomic studies, we had the
2 Travel Montana survey, seminars to inform and stimulate,
3 improve business opportunities for Blackfeet and SK --

4 MR. SLITER: Salish Kootenai.

5 MR. GASKILL: -- Salish Kootenai tribes.

6 We had advertising emphasized with other
7 opportunities in Glacier other than Going-to-the-Sun Road;
8 leveraging dollars for partnerships; focus on public
9 relation strategy; the focus is on --

10 MS. ANSOTEGUI: I can't keep up with what you
11 want to put down.

12 MR. GASKILL: We haven't come to any
13 consensus yet. So I guess the Travel Montana survey is kind
14 of a separate piece because that's collecting more
15 information.

16 The seminars to inform and stimulate, I think is
17 separate, because that's putting -- it's basically -- no,
18 it's kind of a public relation, getting information out and
19 also getting information in on what opportunities exist.
20 And then the improved business opportunities, I think, is a
21 separate idea. This advertising -- and correct me if you
22 don't agree with me -- the advertising and the focus on
23 public relations strategy are trying to get information out
24 to the public. So I guess I see four different
25 socioeconomic strategies you might consider for

1 improvements.

2 MS. LEWIS: Plus leverage.

3 MR. GASKILL: Would you consider that a
4 separate one or not a separate one?

5 MR. GASKILL: Pink group.

6 MR. BROOKE: I'm sorry.

7 MR. SLITER: Oh, we're not an over-achiever
8 now, are we?

9 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Well, the public relations
10 strategy --

11 MS. MOE: I think we were looking at, for the
12 PR and the advertising, looking at leveraging dollars as
13 part of that to provide partnerships so everybody in the
14 immediate area and the region is all on the same page, as
15 far as the Park is open, there's other opportunities in the
16 Park, and that's all part of the PR advertising.

17 MR. GASKILL: Okay.

18 MR. BROOKE: You can get bigger bang for the
19 buck.

20 MR. GASKILL: Makes this piece stronger?

21 MS. MOE: Right.

22 MS. KREMENIK: Do you see some differences in
23 the advertising and PR? We thought that \$50,000 wasn't
24 going to buy us a whole lot of advertising, and so we
25 thought that as an advertising strategy different.

1 MS. MOE: That's why we said both a PR and an
2 advertising strategy.

3 MS. KREMENIK: With 50,000?

4 MS. MOE: We're assuming that these are
5 theoretical and we are partnering and we're leveraging more
6 funds out there.

7 MR. BROOKE: One of the points and the reason
8 we came up with this was the state had 30,000 on the table
9 for Glacier advertising last year. And it got pulled off
10 for reasons that are too lengthy to go into. But if you
11 went back to them with 50,000 and said Hey, look, if we
12 match, everybody would be a winner. And I think they'd go
13 for that because it's doubling everybody's money and
14 everybody has the same interest at heart.

15 MR. GASKILL: So there probably is a separate
16 item. Do we want to attempt to prioritize these five items?

17 MS. KREMENIK: Do we need to?

18 MR. GASKILL: Do we need to? The only reason
19 I need to ask that is if you were to prioritize what is
20 really important and some money became available, you might
21 have a more likely or higher likelihood of that actually
22 occurring than if we had five items, some money became
23 available, there wasn't a specific priority.

24 MS. BURCH: Are you telling us that there
25 might be \$50,000 out there? Is that what you're telling us?

1 MR. GASKILL: I guess I don't have any money.
2 But just knowing how funding works, sometimes these smaller
3 pots of money become available or easier -- become available
4 if you find some source that wasn't expended someplace else,
5 or you can apply for a grant through their source. The
6 smaller pots are a lot easier to do that within the larger
7 pots. So if you have a recommendation from the Committee to
8 do that --

9 MS. KREMENIK: That question, the way it was
10 written, wasn't asking us to prioritize, different options
11 should a \$50,000 pot became available. I think it was more
12 speculative and came up with ideas. We have to reformulate
13 the question, Should be there be a \$50,000 pot available,
14 give a list of ideas and prioritize them. And that's why we
15 didn't.

16 MR. GASKILL: That's what I'm doing now. I
17 guess at this point we'll leave the lists as they are to
18 provide as input, if it appears that one of these things
19 makes sense. It also gives us some direction on what's most
20 important to you in terms of some of the economic
21 opportunities. We'll leave it at that.

22 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Okay; so we'll leave all
23 those on the list for now. And then I guess our final
24 question is, How do you define world class visitor
25 experience? Do you want to take a look at that one?

1 MR. GASKILL: I know group one didn't provide
2 that, but there was a reason for asking the question. It's
3 one of the -- it's one of the criteria that's listed in the
4 project agreement that you came up with at the last meeting.
5 And it said, one of the criteria was to come up with a world
6 class visitor experience in rehabilitating the road.

7 And what I recognize right away is what I might
8 think of as a world class visitor experience may be
9 completely different than what you think is it. And when
10 you look at these two, some of these factors are the same
11 but some are very different.

12 Legendary customer service, authenticity,
13 predictability, consistency, services provided. I think
14 what a visitor experience is to one person is different to
15 another person. An example is, Jean had met with these
16 different groups on Friday. One group had suggested
17 that -- I'm not sure I can get this right. But I remember
18 seeing on one of the lists that one of the preferences was
19 something like a Disney-like experience because they provide
20 such good service and they are so customer oriented, and
21 they mentioned Disney as an example. Another group said
22 not -- absolutely not a Disney-like experience because it's
23 all fake.

24 MR. BAKER: I don't think it was experience;
25 it was connotation.

1 MS. PAHL: Disney is both of those things.
2 And we opted for the legendary customer service but not the
3 plastic part.

4 MR. GASKILL: So if you're more descriptive,
5 it would make it easier for us to concentrate on what those
6 visitor experiences are. If you're trying for the Glacier
7 visitor, what are the things we're trying to provide and
8 what are the things we're not trying to provide? Because
9 it's not a Disney.

10 MS. PAHL: Well, in some ways you wish it
11 were a Disney, but that's, again, why I think our group put
12 down the customer service aspect.

13 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Why don't we go down that
14 list and see.

15 MR. GASKILL: We'll just go through the list.
16 Authenticity, uniqueness. Any problem with that? No
17 plastic ears. Did you say yeah? No plastic ears.
18 Legendary customer service, historical integrity. World
19 heritage site. Predictability, consistency, services
20 provided. Surrounding businesses are doing well reinvesting
21 the business.

22 MR. JACKSON: It was, by reference, the
23 visitor experience back to the previous page.

24 MR. GASKILL: That's right.

25 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Okay; providing answers to

1 all the questions for you with a sufficient direction.

2 MR. GASKILL: We had this experience here.

3 Visitor experience with short delays, provide education and

4 entertainment facilities, opportunities to see

5 Going-to-the-Sun Road, reduce impacts and length of stay and

6 use.

7 CHAIRMAN OGLE: That's in the other category.

8 MR. BROOKE: It's a footnote.

9 MR. GASKILL: Does that sound like a good

10 description of a world class visitor experience? We're not

11 quite there, but we have a transportation subcommittee, and

12 we'll ask them to provide more input. And obviously,

13 anybody else can provide more input as well. So that's it.

14 --oOo--

15 Chairman Ogle then introduces Mary Riddle who is

16 going to give a presentation on public involvement

17 strategies.

18 Mary was asked to speak about the public

19 involvement aspect of this project. She explains that the

20 Park Service is proceeding as if they are going to be doing

21 an environmental impact statement, despite the fact that, as

22 was stated yesterday, the Park does not have funding for

23 that piece of it yet. She asks the Committee to remember

24 that since the notice of intent went out in June, this

25 meeting is taking place under scoping, that this is part of

1 the public involvement process. And as a Committee things
2 that are done as a Committee and as Committee members, are
3 all applied towards public involvement.

4 She went over specific places that things can be
5 done with the public, other than just call a meeting and
6 have the public come and give comment.

7 So the first opportunity that she suggests that
8 the Committee has at this point to do something more with
9 the public is when the conceptual alternatives will be out,
10 the results of this meeting, that they can put them on the
11 web site, they can be summarized. Or if they are rather
12 short, they can just go out as a complete packet. There
13 could be a letter from the Committee and the Superintendent,
14 kind of saying to the public, These are, to date, what we
15 have come up with and that we would like your input on.

16 A series of open houses can be done throughout the
17 state and Canada. And they can also begin meeting with the
18 tribal councils, U.S. Fish and Wildlife, any special
19 interest groups, the State Historic Preservation Office and
20 look at different media opportunities that are available.
21 Perhaps there are a series of stories that the Park would
22 want to do or the Committee might want to talk with the
23 papers about doing. And then finally, kind of as comments
24 are gotten, or what's happened to date, then those comments
25 need to be analyzed and gotten back to the public on that.

1 Then the next place that can be moved to is back
2 to the technical report. Mary suggests that that be made
3 available to the public at the same time the Park Service
4 and the Committee is reviewing it so that there's no -- they
5 get it as it's coming. And, again, kind of go through the
6 same kinds of things that could be done; a letter, media,
7 put it on the web site, issue a summary, have a series of
8 open houses. And then, again, meet with all the entities;
9 the tribal councils, the State Historic Preservation Office,
10 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, perhaps the governor's
11 office as well. And then to get back, again, to look at the
12 comments that are received, go back to the public and
13 transmit those to MK to do the final report. At that point,
14 the public would have the same information the rest are
15 working with.

16 After that, there's the whole NEPA process that is
17 gone through. And where that technical report will be a
18 study and turned into a plan, the alternatives would be
19 analyzed in detail. So remember that what the Committee and
20 the public are getting up to this point, up to the point of
21 a draft EIS, contains none of that environmental analysis.
22 And that's one thing that the Park should be prepared to
23 make a point of. It's a red flag when you go out without
24 the analysis. The Park would release the draft plan and
25 EIS, it would be a 60-day comment period and public

1 meetings.

2 The reason she's noted the EAs and the category
3 exclusions, which is what CX stands for, is because as
4 stated last February, the Park is assuming at this point
5 that it needs to be an environmental impact statement.
6 However, if what comes out of that technical report has
7 already been covered in an environmental impact statement,
8 i.e., the GMP, or if it's been covered enough that the Park
9 can tear out and do an EA, and certainly some of that work
10 will probably be covered under category exclusions, that
11 opens up that door. But at this point, it's safer for all
12 to assume that at least part of that work will be under an
13 EIS. After that period, when these are public hearings,
14 there's a final plan and EIS that goes out. There's a
15 30-day kind of notification period that this is the agency's
16 action, and then a record of decision is issued at that
17 point.

18 Questions are floored.

19 MR. DAKIN: The draft plan, is that the
20 document, the advice document from this Committee to the
21 Secretary of the Interior?

22 MS. RIDDLE: I think that -- I would think
23 that it's this technical report is the advice document to
24 the Secretary from the Committee.

25 MR. DAKIN: Okay. But we don't really plan to

1 have that until September of '01.

2 MS. RIDDLE: This is April.

3 MR. DAKIN: I'm lost here.

4 MS. RIDDLE: So then July, is that what --

5 MR. BABB: It would be after the Committee
6 meeting, assuming the committee meets in May. It would be
7 after that, probably July.

8 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Tony.

9 MR. JEWETT: Mary, were you here yet where we
10 had this whole discussion about -- I'm just curious -- the
11 public involvement parts of this, as you go through each
12 stage? Are there minutes to be commented both on the work
13 of the Committee and the formulation of the technical report
14 as well as part of the scoping for EIS? They serve a dual
15 purpose?

16 MS. RIDDLE: Yes.

17 MR. JEWETT: So we will get the EIS scoping
18 done as we go through the work we're doing, even though we
19 don't have the full --

20 MS. RIDDLE: Right.

21 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Will, did you have a
22 question?

23 MR. BROOKE: I guess it's maybe a question
24 and comment. I understood from yesterday that we couldn't
25 move forward with much of anything without the funding. And

1 I reacted pretty strongly to that, shot my mouth off maybe a
2 little bit, as I'm one to do.

3 My concern is, and the reason I reacted that way
4 is, I think your whole outline here tracks along the lines
5 that I was thinking that we would be moving forward and that
6 is together. And one of the biggest concerns I have is
7 related to the funding, or lack of it. If that doesn't come
8 along and isn't aggressively pursued, then I can foresee a
9 situation where this Committee is done and a draft EIS and
10 all that stuff doesn't come along and, you know, we lose our
11 focus and attention on this. And I think that would be a
12 real crime to see that happen, because this body can provide
13 a lot of grassroots support to get the necessary funding,
14 whatever that is, to get this project done.

15 And if the public involvement tracks along the
16 same time that we're moving through this, I think it's going
17 to have a really big wallop effect. And the flip side of
18 that is, if it doesn't, I think this thing -- it won't die
19 of its own weight, but it's going to be much more difficult
20 for the Park Service to move forward and get the funding and
21 do it in a timely fashion and keep the ball rolling. So in
22 that regard, I would, at some point, like to -- I don't know
23 if now is the appropriate time, but move to have this
24 Committee, under signature of the chairman, send a letter to
25 the delegation stressing the importance of funding for the

1 draft and the environmental impact statement, assuming there
2 is one, and I think we've all assumed that, so that that
3 gets on the plate and gets in the priority mix so we can get
4 that thing going.

5 MR. DAKIN: Second.

6 CHAIRMAN OGLE: All right; there's been a
7 motion made. What's the motion then, Will?

8 MR. BROOKE: That this Committee formally
9 recommend and receive funding -- the necessary funding for
10 the draft environmental impact statement and public
11 involvement process necessitated by NEPA from the -- from
12 Congress.

13 CHAIRMAN OGLE: A letter to each member of
14 our congressional delegation?

15 MR. BROOKE: As well as, you know, the
16 involved Park Service personnel. For instance, the regional
17 director, the director of the National Park Service.

18 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Any discussion on the motion?
19 Anna Marie.

20 MS. MOE: I'd like to amend the motion to
21 also include the chairman of the natural resources
22 committee.

23 MR. SLITER: Well, at least probably the
24 appropriation subcommittee on natural resources or whatever
25 the --

1 MR. BROOKE: All the usual suspects.

2 MS. MOE: Exactly.

3 MS. LEWIS: Appropriate congressional
4 committees.

5 MR. JEWETT: There's been some comments made
6 about this issue over the last 24 hours about price tag and
7 process. One, some people thought was an estimate
8 that -- an estimate was given 1.4, whatever it was. We
9 ought to include the accurate amount in the letter so that
10 the delegation knows what to ask for.

11 MR. BROOKE: We could say something like It
12 is our understanding, The best estimate at this time is, so
13 at least it's in the ballpark.

14 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Any further discussion on the
15 motion?

16 MS. PAHL: A question to Mary. If I
17 understood you correctly, you're proceeding with the public
18 involvement and National Park Service staff as if you were
19 going to continue with the project.

20 MS. RIDDLE: Yes.

21 MR. O'QUINN: You're picking it up, and
22 whenever funding comes along, you contract out. But right
23 now, you're taking the ball and running with it.

24 MS. RIDDLE: Yeah. Because up to -- what's
25 funded now is basically up to the technical.

1 MR. O'QUINN: Background work.

2 MS. RIDDLE: And that's all information that
3 should be shared with the public, can be shared with the
4 public and that we can get input on. So why not.

5 MS. ANDERSON: Question for Mary. Mary, is
6 it accurate to characterize that the work that you're
7 proposing the Committee stay with would be work that we
8 would need to do -- or this Committee would need to do
9 regardless of the need for an EIS?

10 MS. RIDDLE: Yes. And that's why I kind of
11 said later -- I mean, at this point, we are all assuming
12 that it's going to be an EIS. But until we see the
13 technical report, we won't really be able to make that
14 determination. And so, you know, in the normal process of
15 developing a project, we would be involving the public at
16 certain points. And so, yeah. And again, this Committee is
17 part of that process. And you're part of our ability to
18 talk with the public.

19 MR. JACKSON: Well, a substantial part of the
20 socioeconomic analysis was spun off with the idea that it
21 would be done in an EIS. And that would mean if an EIS
22 wouldn't be done, it wouldn't be done at all. Is that what
23 you're suggesting; we won't have to do it if we don't do an
24 EIS?

25 MS. LEWIS: No.

1 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Bill.

2 MR. DAKIN: Well, we did have a discussion in
3 February about -- that led through that whole thing which
4 was, we believed and I still believe, that aside from the
5 various construction elements of this project, the fact that
6 the economic ramifications of it are consequential, it's
7 almost inevitable that we will have to do an EIS. Because,
8 otherwise, we're going to get sued. It's just -- as Barney
9 said, it's a cost of doing business. I'd be really thrilled
10 if we didn't have to, but it's going to have to be done. I
11 just feel it.

12 MR. O'QUINN: I think she can probably
13 identify some work, if they get funded for that work, that
14 can be done short of an EIS. But the entire project, as
15 we're discussing, most likely is going to require one.

16 MS. RIDDLE: And I look at the alpine section
17 as that piece -- that's is so difficult and will be very
18 problematic in terms of visitor use and experience and
19 protection of resources, both cultural and natural. And so,
20 yeah.

21 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Suzann?

22 MS. LEWIS: Again, I apologize for maybe not
23 articulating or characterizing. I didn't mean to insinuate
24 that an EIS would not be needed as I was simply trying to
25 draw attention to the work that I -- that Mary has put up on

1 the two flip charts would be work that is inherent to the
2 primary commissions of this Committee under its charter in
3 terms of how, under FACA and as an Advisory Committee
4 appointed by the Secretary, of the kind of public
5 information or public involvement strategy that you would
6 want to go through anyway. So, no, I wasn't suggesting that
7 there's any consideration that some portions are specific
8 portions of what may be in technical reports would be
9 covered under an EIS. I apologize for not being clear on
10 that.

11 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Suzann, with regard to this
12 motion, do you have an estimate for us as to how much might
13 be necessary to do an EIS?

14 MS. LEWIS: One point one million.

15 MR. BABB: That's the current estimate.

16 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Further discussion on Will's
17 motion?

18 MS. ANSOTEGUI: Will made a motion for the
19 Committee to actively seek funding for the EIS and public
20 participation that has to do with the NEPA process. Letters
21 will be sent to congressional delegations, director of the
22 National Park Service and the appropriate congressional
23 committees.

24 MR. BROOKE: Did you get my pay raise in
25 there?

1 MS. ANSOTEGUI: No. Was that the 1.1
2 million?

3 MS. LEWIS: Add regional director to that
4 list.

5 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Any more discussion on the
6 motion? Everyone understand it?

7 Motion is made that we, as a Committee, send a
8 letter to the congressional delegation and other appropriate
9 committees or administrators requesting funding for an EIS
10 for the Going-to-the-Sun Road project.

11 No further discussion; all in favor signify by
12 raising your hand.

13 (All Committee members raised hand.)

14 CHAIRMAN OGLE: All opposed?

15 (No raised hand.)

16 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Motion passes.

17 Any more questions or discussion for Mary?

18 I guess I have one. I guess this is about as good
19 a time as any to bring it up. And I think this is something
20 that has caused some of our confusion here at this meeting.
21 And we ought to clarify the record.

22 When we got our agenda, we thought we were going
23 to be hearing from MK Centennial, findings and
24 recommendations yesterday. And in Fred's project schedule,
25 we thought we were going to be hearing findings and

1 recommendations and conceptual engineering alternatives, and
2 that's on Mary's list as well, for the September meeting. I
3 think that was our mind-set when we came into this meeting,
4 and that's kind of what we were expecting to receive from
5 MK Centennial up to this point. I think that's what was
6 scheduled back in February, but we haven't received any of
7 that.

8 We haven't received any findings or
9 recommendations or conceptual alternatives. We've been
10 asked for some more input. And so just to clarify the
11 record, I think we better make sure that our schedule
12 reflects not that we had a findings and recommendations at
13 this meeting, or conceptual engineering alternatives, but
14 requests for more input. Because I don't want -- we didn't
15 get any of that stuff. I don't think we should be saying
16 that we got that.

17 MR. BABB: Let me say something in response
18 to that. In terms of the findings and recommendations and,
19 Dayna, you've got to help me out a little bit here, I think
20 I believe we got findings and recommendations during the
21 summer or late summer in regards to the literature and
22 discussions and things like that that we had with people.
23 But that we haven't sort of crystallized the final -- in
24 other words, there's not a short document on paper or report
25 that says Hey, this is what we found in regards to the road.

1 Whether we agree in essence with what the Federal Highways
2 or Park Service has done or we disagree.

3 There's two things. One we got in July -- we got
4 a document that's basically findings and recommendations
5 based on information related to the rehabilitation of the
6 road. We did receive that. MK followed through on the
7 contract and prepared that. I'm sorry; it's findings and
8 recommendations based on review of information related to
9 Going-to-the-Sun Road rehabilitation/reconstruction.

10 MS. HUDSON: That's something I E-mailed out
11 to everybody.

12 MR. DAKIN: Can I ask a question about that?

13 MR. BABB: Go ahead.

14 MR. DAKIN: That was what we all got in June.
15 I think it was dated June 21st.

16 MR. BABB: Yes.

17 MR. DAKIN: And we were to respond by June
18 30th, and we were somewhat chastised because not enough of
19 us responded. But those of us who did respond, then never
20 saw another draft of this or anything. Where did this paper
21 go? That's always been a puzzle to me. I never saw a final
22 document that said Findings and Recommendations. There was
23 just the draft that asked for our comment. And then nothing
24 happened after that.

25 MR. BABB: What I understand, and Craig

1 correct me, is then they did some more work, including field
2 reconnaissance. And, in essence, what's going to happen
3 next, and correct me if I'm wrong, but we originally said
4 there would be sort of a document that pools all that
5 together. And it could be short. I mean, you're not going
6 to look for something this thick. But it will say Based on
7 this, this is our conclusions on looking at the literature
8 and reconnaissance of the area. And to my knowledge we're
9 still doing that, but we just haven't gotten that; is that
10 correct?

11 MR. GASKILL: Do you want me to respond? I
12 think there's been some confusion about just what some
13 Committee members expect, if not all Committee members
14 expect, and what actually came out. I think some of that
15 problem came from the February and March meetings of what
16 the expectations were. I think what we presented may not
17 have been findings and recommendations of the alternatives
18 as I think some people thought, but it was
19 findings/recommendations of what we've done to date and may
20 not have been as much as some people thought it was going to
21 be at the time.

22 There was this findings/recommendations report
23 that came out, as Bill referred to. And we did get, I
24 think, three sets of comments back. We took those comments
25 and basically came up with a scope of services. This really

1 kind of developed the scope of services for the next piece
2 of work. And then we started that next piece of work in
3 August, and have been basically identifying what the
4 deficiencies of the road are and preparing for this meeting
5 so we could talk about that. So maybe the
6 findings/recommendations is what we have discovered during
7 our literature search and what we discovered when we were up
8 on the road. But it certainly isn't findings and
9 recommendations in the alternatives. So we want to better
10 describe that maybe that's what you're suggesting is, better
11 define what we actually meant. Maybe we could do that.

12 I think the other thing -- findings and
13 recommendations. And the second piece was, oh, the
14 engineering alternatives. And that, really, what I
15 presented was traffic management options as a way to present
16 alternatives. It really wasn't engineering alternatives.
17 Because -- and maybe Barney might agree, that engineering
18 alternatives is how you're going to construct something and
19 what those different alternatives are. So maybe we need to
20 just classify what it is we actually presented so that it's
21 clear in the record.

22 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I just wanted to clarify the
23 record. I received this document. I read it. And most of
24 it said what information you had reviewed and more study was
25 going to be done. And then I thought we were going to get

1 some more findings and recommendations at this meeting. And
2 then on one of the agenda items was conceptual engineering
3 alternatives. It could be just the fact that I'm obtuse
4 because I'm a layperson not an engineer. But none of those
5 seems to me, in my layman's mind, to be findings,
6 recommendations or conceptual engineering alternatives. So
7 I just wanted to make sure that the record was clear and
8 that the record didn't reflect that something had been
9 accomplished that hadn't.

10 MR. BABB: But I think -- I appreciate you
11 bringing it up, because I think it's pretty deep. If you go
12 with the first one, findings/recommendations or condition
13 assessment, whatever we want to call it, the one task was
14 for MK to come back and look at what the Park Service,
15 Federal Highway and everything has been doing in the past
16 and whether there's any new things that are there or whether
17 additional studies are required for this level of planning.
18 We didn't get a document to that. But what I took away from
19 yesterday, and someone correct me if I'm wrong, was yeah,
20 they agreed with the majority of the things that Federal
21 Highway and others had been working on, recognizing that
22 it's not all in one document, and at this time there is not
23 a need for the level of detailed work doing right now to do
24 additional data collection such as geotechnical or anything
25 like that. Is that correct? Is that what we agreed to

1 yesterday?

2 CHAIRMAN OGLE: That's what I understood.

3 MR. BABB: And then the second thing is, on
4 the alternatives, everything we produced in the scope of
5 services in regards to the project agreement, everything
6 we've called engineering alternatives, when Federal
7 Highways -- or not Federal Highway -- when MK Centennial
8 agreed, they said that the best way, and we agreed with
9 them, the best way to organize those engineering
10 alternatives were by time. So to me, they did present
11 those -- and it's a play on words -- those preliminary
12 alternatives. But they're based on time or they're going to
13 organize the alternatives by time. That's what I came away
14 with in the discussion.

15 And now they're going to flush out all the details
16 in regards to the factors in regards to those alternatives.
17 If we're going to do another set of alternatives or a
18 different set of alternatives, then we need to check back in
19 in some fashion. Because we plan, like Mary said, to take
20 these -- call them the alternatives organized by time, and
21 that's what we plan to in October and November, as Mary had
22 up there, use that part as our scoping for the general
23 focus; right?

24 CHAIRMAN OGLE: And, again, it could just be
25 my experience. I thought that there would be something that

1 said Here's alternative one, alternative two, alternative
2 three, alternative four, and we'd talk about them. We just
3 haven't gotten to that point yet. I didn't want the record
4 to reflect that we had something had been accomplished
5 that --

6 MR. BABB: Didn't accomplish.

7 MR. O'QUINN: Randy, I'm going to probably
8 say so on some of the same things, and maybe I'm not
9 understanding. What I had was a draft project agreement or
10 task directives, and it was dated February, revised in May
11 and revised again in June. And that's what I thought,
12 although it wasn't a signed copy, that MK was working one.
13 And then we got what was referred to as the June 21st
14 information. And that's what we commented on.

15 My understanding what findings and recommendations
16 was supposed to provide everything that was required in this
17 scope of services, and in my opinion, it did not. And
18 that's what my comments said. Now, I have not seen -- and
19 you're the contracting officer. And maybe you agreed that
20 it did, but I haven't seen a revised report from the June
21 21st report, other than we've discussed it.

22 MR. BABB: That's correct.

23 MR. O'QUINN: And it kind of went in a black
24 hole.

25 MR. BABB: I agree.

1 MR. O'QUINN: You could have said they have
2 met the requirements of the scope of services, they've done
3 everything they're supposed to do, and in some discussions
4 it's a good possibility they have. But this report did not
5 reflect that.

6 Now, again, when we get ready to go forward to the
7 NEPA part of this study, we're going to have to have some
8 fairly well-defined alternatives. And those alternatives
9 may be various levels of construction. How much of it are
10 you going to do? Anywhere from the no-action alternative to
11 minimum improvements to the whole ball of wax or something
12 in between. And I think this is part of what Randy's
13 talking about. It's not so much are you going to go on the
14 east side of the Park or the north side of the Park with a
15 new alternative location. I don't think anyone's talking
16 about that. But what are the alternatives for improving the
17 road? Is it all or nothing? Or are there modifications
18 that may or may not involve some of the cultural resources
19 or may or may not involve all of the what you would love to
20 do with regard to engineering? I think there are going to
21 be steps in there that are going to be evaluated, and we
22 haven't seen that.

23 MR. BABB: So to paraphrase that back, what
24 I'm hearing is what you want to see is, you want to see
25 the -- I'll call it the reconnaissance or finding

1 recommendations all tied back together so we have a step
2 where we looked at the road and here's what MK Centennial
3 finds regarding their reconnaissance and meeting and that.
4 And then you'd want to see a better description in regard to
5 the alternatives that we're moving forward with and closure
6 to this process or this step or this spot in the process.
7 Okay.

8 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Susie.

9 MS. BURCH: I missed a step here. You
10 started talking about time. So you're saying we have seen
11 sets of alternatives but they've been presented by time; is
12 that right?

13 MR. BABB: That's what I said. I don't know
14 whether MK sees it that way. That's what I said.

15 MS. BURCH: Because, boy, I missed that whole
16 part. I'm not even on the same page. And I don't
17 understand what we're talking about.

18 MR. BABB: When they went through
19 the -- where's that sheet, Craig, you had up there, those
20 seven?

21 MS. LEWIS: Do you mean traffic? Do you mean
22 traffic flow, not time.

23 MR. BABB: Yeah, traffic management. I'm
24 sorry; I shouldn't have used time. I can't see. The
25 options, whatever that says; traffic management options.

1 MS. BURCH: That's how -- when we get our
2 technical report in April, that's how we should be expecting
3 to see that presented? Is if we go with this or these
4 combinations or so on, here's how we would do it and here's
5 what the mitigation strategies would tie to that; is that
6 right? Or am I just not --

7 MR. GASKILL: I think that you would expect
8 that we'll come back with some alternatives. An example
9 might be a one-way traffic alternative. And that
10 alternative consists of one-way traffic during the following
11 times. It would consist of the following construction
12 techniques, it would cost a certain amount, it would provide
13 the following type of economic opportunities, and that might
14 be similar to other ones. It would --

15 MS. BURCH: Take this long.

16 MR. GASKILL: -- require the following
17 visitor improvements, it would require certain elements of
18 the transportation system to be modified perhaps, and it may
19 not. There may be some pullouts that we want to put in for
20 some interpretation to provide visitor opportunities during
21 the construction because of the one-way. And these are
22 things we want to look at. But the bottom line is, you're
23 going to know how long that construction or the
24 rehabilitation will take and at what times we're going to
25 have restrictions on the road under that alternative. And

1 that alternative really drives all those other answers. So
2 that's -- I think that's what Barney's looking for, in terms
3 of what the study is.

4 MR. O'QUINN: No, I think you've got a
5 matrix. I think you've got a series of improvement levels.
6 Anywhere from your \$50,000 to two hundred million dollars.
7 And a lot of what you can do on this road depends on what
8 kind of funding you're going to get. Now, what are your
9 highest priorities? Are they the drainage? Is it the
10 geotechnical? Is it the walls? What are they? So you've
11 got levels of improvement which are going to be your
12 alternatives.

13 Across from that, you're going to have ways of
14 implementing that, all the way from working nights to
15 Sundays, whatever the criteria is. So if you're going to do
16 it all, you're going to come across here and you're going to
17 pick and choose how you're going to build it. If you're not
18 going to do anything but the walls, you don't need to close
19 it in the off season, probably. So you've got -- on the one
20 hand you've got different levels of improvement as being
21 your construction alternatives, and on the other hand,
22 you've got the scenario of how you go about doing it.

23 Now, because some of those construction techniques
24 and some of those things you might be going to do or
25 proposing to do could have cultural impacts such that they

1 would be taking away from the build part of the alternative,
2 that's what I was looking at is your alternatives or what
3 you're proposing to do, your actions, not how you're going
4 to go about them and the time frame that meet together. And
5 that gives you, depending on the amount of time you've got,
6 how long it's going to take. I mean, the scenario you're
7 operating under, how long it's going to take you to do it,
8 and that will drive the cost. Now, that's the way I see it;
9 time being on one line and level of improvement on the
10 other.

11 CHAIRMAN OGLE: And that's the type of thing,
12 even I, as an uninitiated engineer, was thinking of we would
13 be receiving at some point. And I don't know if this is the
14 right time to be receiving it or not, but I didn't want it
15 to look like it had already been done when it hadn't.
16 That's all I wanted to say.

17 MR. BABB: Can I just say one other thing?
18 What Barney said is exactly what MK has, in essence,
19 prepared, is a matrix which is what we worked with them on
20 back on -- what was it, during the week of the 11th.

21 MR. HYMAS: Right.

22 MR. BABB: And what they were getting ready
23 to do, or maybe they've done it already, is taking that
24 matrix and start filling it in. And when we met with them,
25 we thought we should try to focus first on agreeing that

1 people saw the management aspects as the framework; that
2 we're going to start with this matrix and then with the
3 factors down the other column where it was.

4 MR. HYMAS: We're in the process of doing
5 just exactly what you're asking here, Barney, in many
6 respects. Now, some of us are going to this thinking that
7 Congressman Hill has got this goose coop behind his place
8 with this magic goose in it that lays golden eggs. And if
9 so, we're going to have enough money to do it all. But what
10 if we don't have enough money to do it all, only a part of
11 it? Then what part are we going to do first? And how are
12 we going to do that part? Are we going to recycle the road?
13 Are we going to bring in fresh pavement? Are we going to go
14 into the base course? There are an infinite number of
15 alternatives.

16 We have identified on this matrix a timeline.
17 We're going to be revising this matrix due to the excellent
18 input from the Committee. But here we show road closure,
19 combination, curtailed visits. All these are along one top
20 of the matrix. Down the other side is a list of the
21 deficiencies; guard walls, stone masonry rails, structural
22 walls, various types of repair and options that we can put
23 into those repair activities. Each one will carry a
24 different weight, a different opportunity for funding. All
25 of these things will be involved.

1 This is something that is going to be worked on,
2 and it will be part of the final report we're charged with
3 presenting to the Committee as an end result in April or
4 June or in that area. And, again, we are working towards
5 these. The very first part of those steps is this field
6 reconnaissance review that we've completed. That was quite
7 an in-depth review for a full week. And I've shared a
8 little bit of information with Fred and others about some of
9 the things we activated there. This is brand new to Fred,
10 because we just got through with it. We just shipped him
11 some of the information. And, you know, it would have been
12 great, maybe, if we'd had two more weeks to prepare for this
13 meeting, but everybody's schedule was pretty well set, and
14 we did need input from the Committee regarding the important
15 points that Craig has brought up. They will help us develop
16 this matrix to where it makes sense to not only you, Barney,
17 even Will. Will will even figure out what we're talking
18 about when we're through there. I can kid him back because
19 he's a kidder, I know. But this is what we're shooting for.
20 And it's going to take a lot of cooperation and a lot of
21 input from the Committee and from the Park Service, from
22 Federal Highways, from MK Centennial, because we're working
23 in this as partners.

24 MR. O'QUINN: Well, I think the confusion was
25 some of us thought we were going to see that this week.

1 MR. HYMAS: I understand.

2 MR. BABB: And one thing on that you all
3 should be aware of is, MK has been doing a lot of work,
4 especially in the socioeconomic arena, and they did a lot of
5 that even before we had a signed contract, to use as an
6 example. With our own bureaucracy, and I guess to learn to
7 work together or whatever you use, the reasons for the main
8 contract that we signed, it took us a long time to do that.
9 And I think there was give and take on both sides, and we
10 had to work within the dollars. So it took us a good
11 several months to actually formalize that contract, which
12 is, like Craig said, didn't occur until the middle of -- or
13 the beginning of August, probably the middle of August. So,
14 you know, there was time in that in regards to the
15 alternatives.

16 But I think that MK is proceeding in the direction
17 that you all are saying and, in particular, what you're
18 saying, Barney, in regards to doing a matrix and looking at
19 it so that everybody can understand and make sense of those.
20 And I think we can -- I mean, MK, I don't mean to speak for
21 them -- but we can probably take some of the stuff that
22 they're going to send us -- and that's probably what you're
23 going to be looking for -- we can take that and send that
24 out. But I think it would be smart to make the corrections
25 that you guys are suggesting here before we send that back

1 out to you or before MK sends it in.

2 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Linda.

3 MS. ANDERSON: I guess, as you've used the
4 term -- the layman's term, maybe some of the confusion that
5 a lot of us are feeling are we wouldn't be sitting here
6 feeling that way if maybe some of this had either been
7 explained yesterday before we started this process or even
8 before we got here. That might have made it easier to
9 understand what you actually have done and how we're fitting
10 into the picture.

11 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Bill.

12 MR. DAKIN: It would have been really helpful
13 to even get copies of the signed contract, once you had
14 figured that out so we really knew, instead of these series
15 of drafts, scopes of services that -- what was supposed to
16 be delivered. Then we wouldn't have spent yesterday asking
17 dumb questions that you knew the answer to but we're kind of
18 clueless.

19 MR. BABB: That's fair. I would agree. The
20 other thing that we've talked about doing is, Craig and I
21 have worked up a way where what we're going to do -- Craig
22 is going to submit or is submitting monthly status reports,
23 more or less. And so we've talked about that in our
24 transportation group is, we're going to then send them right
25 back out to the Committee so that you'll get a status report

1 on that basis. And then if the Park Service is doing
2 anything additional to MK but it relates to Going-to-the-Sun
3 Road, then we'll add that to it too. You'll get a monthly
4 status report on where we are on the project.

5 MR. DAKIN: I think that would really help.
6 It would have helped me a lot.

7 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Paul.

8 MR. SLITER: I'm sorry if I plow some ground
9 that's been plowed, but I want to make sure that I know
10 where we stand.

11 During the field reconnaissance review, were
12 the -- I assume that what you were doing there was to review
13 and to identify the deficiencies and the future needs of the
14 road, and you've documented those.

15 MR. GASKILL: Yeah. And we'll have a report
16 pretty shortly that actually documents as a report. Right
17 now we just had the summary we handed out yesterday.

18 MR. SLITER: So the scoping and
19 reconnaissance report has yet to be finalized?

20 MR. GASKILL: Yes.

21 MR. SLITER: Okay.

22 MR. GASKILL: And I'm pretty confident that
23 everything that's in this project agreement that you
24 referred to is in the scope that we now have. But it's just
25 that you won't get all the products until -- but mostly in

1 April and then we'll be finalized in June. So what you've
2 seen to date is really just a short period of time working
3 under that project.

4 MR. SLITER: One more quick question. Just
5 let's cut through it all and find out for sure. Were we all
6 expecting to be seeing something that we never should have
7 expected by now? Or are we behind schedule? Are we -- were
8 we wrong in thinking that we would get the information that
9 we thought we were going to get at this meeting? Are we
10 behind? Are we -- I mean, was the delays -- were the delays
11 in developing the contract?

12 MR. BABB: Yes.

13 MR. SLITER: The reason we didn't get
14 information we were expecting to get now, how did that all
15 fit together? Why does the Committee sit here and wonder
16 why we're looking for information that's not available? Did
17 we misunderstand? Did something not get done? What led to
18 all that?

19 MR. BABB: I think it was primarily the
20 contracting that did put us behind schedule. And then I
21 think what Craig and I were meaning the Park Service and MK
22 is doing, is trying to get us or keep us on schedule. And
23 what we spent a lot of time talking about -- Well, are we
24 going to be able to have some conceptual alternatives ready
25 to present to the Committee? We talked about Well, should

1 we delay everything X-amount of time? And whether it was
2 the right decision or wrong decision, we sort of came to the
3 conclusion that we should move forward and that we should
4 get input into those alternatives, which we thought then
5 would make it easier down the line. And Craig and I have
6 sort of tried to work on that schedule so we still have the
7 same output at the end of the tunnel so to speak. And we're
8 within probably, plus or minus, assuming we continue to work
9 the way we are right now, we're probably within two to four
10 weeks of meeting the original schedule that we set back in
11 February. And that's been both MK's and the Park Service's.

12 And I think a lot of the points that you all are
13 making are good points and that, you know, we're going to
14 make a better effort to get things out in a timely manner;
15 keep you more involved, make sure you're up to date so to
16 speak and really embrace the idea of partnership or however
17 you want to say that. I don't know how Craig feels, but
18 that's how I would answer your question.

19 MR. GASKILL: I guess I would have -- putting
20 myself back in February, February, March meeting, I would
21 have looked forward to this meeting and would have thought
22 that we would have had more information than we have right
23 now. I would have just looked at the study and said Yeah,
24 we'll have a lot more information. I didn't anticipate that
25 it would take a while to come to agreement on all the things

1 we had to come to. And it took longer than I thought it
2 was. We do have an agreement that takes us to the end of
3 the project now which, fortunately, we have that. So we
4 don't have any more of these -- having to spend this time
5 trying to negotiate this. That means we can get to the end
6 of the project at the same period of time we had, so our
7 overall schedule doesn't change.

8 I think just this midpoint would have been a
9 little later than you might have anticipated or we did. And
10 as Fred mentioned, we talked about What are the options in
11 terms of Committee? Do we try to delay the Committee so we
12 could have more information for you? And there were some
13 limitations on that because if we go much further, we
14 couldn't get up on the road. We felt that was pretty
15 important to get you up on the road and see what was up
16 there. So we made sure that we could get our experts on the
17 road, we would have the ability to tell you what our
18 opinions were on the road, what our condition assessment was
19 so that we could identify that as part of this meeting. But
20 by going a couple weeks later, well, would we have been able
21 to provide the engineering alternatives? I'm not sure that
22 we would have. And it may not have worked for you.

23 I think we're -- overall schedule, we're okay
24 right now; probably not quite what you expected.

25 MR. BABB: I would say one other thing. I

1 hope you all feel that the discussions were worth something.
2 Craig and I have talked, and we think we got an awful lot
3 out of the meeting. I know we're not done yet. But I mean
4 that's how we feel. I hope you guys feel that same way.

5 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Tony.

6 MR. JEWETT: Rather than revise it in the
7 past, I'd like to maybe visit about the future. I'm
8 anticipating, if I am correctly, that between now and the
9 next time we meet, which is five months, I think, that
10 you're going to be spending an awful lot of time taking the
11 information you've gotten, both in your reconnaissance and
12 your studies as well as the input you've gotten from over
13 the course of the last couple days, beginning to draft
14 alternatives; is that accurate?

15 MR. GASKILL: Uh-huh.

16 MR. JEWETT: And I think for that period of
17 five months, it would be really valuable for me to not have
18 those alternatives presented to me in April but to
19 have -- to establish some system of dynamic dialogue,
20 through E-mail or whatever, where we kind of knew where you
21 were headed and how you were compartmentalizing all these
22 things and the alternatives so that we could provide
23 feedback when we thought it was appropriate on issues
24 related to the transportation systems or the interpretive
25 stuff, whatever it is you're integrating. It would help me

1 keep up to date with what you're doing rather than be
2 surprised by it.

3 MR. GASKILL: That's an excellent suggestion.
4 It would help us, as well as it would help you, to have a
5 good dialogue back and forth; something that was easy and
6 efficient so that you would be up to date with where we're
7 at, making sure our feet are going in the direction that you
8 see us going in and anticipate us going in. And you would
9 know what we're doing, so when we come to the meeting in
10 May, you know, and have the same reaction that you're not
11 getting what you thought you were going to get; you're
12 getting something different.

13 And if we could set something up that obviously is
14 going to be more dynamic than what we had in the past number
15 of months, I think that would be excellent, from our
16 perspective. But I guess I would have to leave it up -- you
17 had a discussion at the last meeting about how you wanted
18 that communication to work, and so I think as a Committee
19 would expect you probably need some discussion on just how
20 that communication might work from your perspective.

21 CHAIRMAN OGLE: The discussion the last
22 meeting was just that it should be through the Park Service
23 so it's available to the public. I don't think -- I think
24 we can say, without discussing it much, that we would like
25 to have as much information as early as possible. So as

1 Tony says, if you can provide some of these conceptual
2 alternatives through the Park Service to the Committee
3 members as early as possible, I think that would help us.
4 Because we are a little behind schedule now. And to get
5 this information right before the next meeting, we're not
6 going to have very much time to digest it and really reflect
7 on it and comment on it at the meetings, if we don't get
8 some advance time to look at it.

9 Any other comments, thoughts? I appreciate the
10 discussion. And we're a little behind time, so why don't we
11 take a ten-minute break and -- I'm sorry, Mary, you weren't
12 finished.

13 MS. RIDDLE: I wanted to make two points.
14 One is that I guess I would like to invite the Committee to
15 host these open houses with us. And that might mean that
16 one or two or three of you attend those meetings and help us
17 be there to talk with the public as we are also, and explain
18 and hear their input about the -- whether it's the
19 conceptual engineering alternatives or later the technical
20 report.

21 And then, secondly, that the Committee, which I'm
22 happy to see has formed this public involvement committee,
23 and that I would like to suggest that you all also
24 advise -- give us some advice on how, as we get ready to go
25 to the public with certain things, that you look at that or

1 that we -- and I could bounce the ideas off of you as to how
2 to do that or that you look at stuff before it gets sent out
3 to the public.

4 CHAIRMAN OGLE: We did get off track, and I
5 apologize to Mary for that.

6 Are there any specific comments to Mary as to her
7 public involvement strategies that she has recommended?
8 Anybody have any additions, corrections, suggestions for
9 Mary?

10 MS. MOE: I do have a question. You said
11 public review a letter from the Committee and
12 Superintendent. Who are you sending that to?

13 MS. RIDDLE: It would go to -- the mailing
14 list to the general public.

15 MS. PAHL: Do you have one on the west side
16 and the east side?

17 MS. RIDDLE: The mailing list is about 7,000
18 people, right now.

19 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Mary, thanks so much.

20 Why don't we take about a ten-minute break. We
21 have a public comment period coming up at 3:30, and we have
22 an Advisory Committee business meeting next to decide about
23 when our next meeting should be and discuss any other
24 Committee matters we need to.

25 (Proceedings in recess from 2:43 p.m. to

1 3:00 p.m.)

2 Whereupon the Advisory Committee business meeting
3 was held, chaired by Chairman, Randy Ogle.

4 Discussion was held on when the next meeting will
5 be and how long it will take and what is to be accomplished
6 between now and the next meeting. Discussion was held about
7 what needs to be done between now and the next meeting and
8 how long the next meeting will be and when. Input was
9 requested from Suzann or Fred as to what should be
10 accomplished. Ms. Lewis asks the fundamental question how
11 much time is needed for the next meeting. What consultant
12 and Fred think are the products that or the activities the
13 Committee needs to engage in between now and then and what
14 the Park Service and the contractor will be engaged in.

15 Mr. Babb relates to the four committees that were
16 in session. In terms of the meeting though, the second part
17 of the meeting, the whole focus is going to be on the draft
18 report, whatever it ends up looking like, that will be sent
19 out roughly the first week in April to give the Committee
20 six weeks for review. For clarification, Ms. Lewis confirms
21 when referring to a draft report, these are complete reports
22 and are not executive summaries that will be ready by April
23 the next year, including all the pertinent data that is
24 necessary. So they're not summary, they're not executive,
25 they're full reports. Mr. Babb states two days for the

1 third meeting is enough if people read the documents and all
2 are prepared before the meeting.

3 Mr. O'Quinn makes reference to the four
4 subcommittees, and asks what is expected. Mr. Babb responds
5 by saying transportation/visitor use, the group came up with
6 some pretty good ways of communicating over the next six
7 months in regards to how they can work as a group and how
8 they can communicate as a committee. And it's basically
9 providing input with regards to transportation and visitor
10 use for rehabilitation of the road and really not long-term.
11 So a focus has been developed for the effort that can be
12 presented through the ideas on that.

13 Mr. Dakin follows that up with the engineering
14 subcommittee. They defined some ways that they would like
15 to keep in contact. He inquires about when having a
16 question or a comment that they want to forward to Kay or to
17 Jay, someone at MK Centennial, the understanding of the
18 protocol is that that needs to be done through Fred, along
19 with any answers, in return go through Fred. He inquires s
20 to whether that is workable and proper. Mr. Babb responded
21 that that's the way it is being done now. However, he
22 suggests that unless the inquiry relates to time and money,
23 he does not feel the necessity to go through the Park
24 Service.

25 The subcommittee would function as a group and it

1 would be sort of an E-mail tree that all would communicate
2 through among that group. And then each subcommittee would
3 capitalize on the monthly status reports. And Mr. Gaskill
4 and Fred would also put all the new events that took place
5 in the various subcommittees in those monthly status
6 reports. So everybody is getting a monthly briefing on
7 what's happening with MK and their work with Park Service is
8 doing and anything the subcommittees came up with. That way
9 the subcommittee can communicate as much as they want among
10 themselves, and only time and money had to come through Fred
11 as opposed to everything coming through the project
12 management office. And whatever is decided should probably
13 go through Ed Tafoya and DSC, who's the contracting officer
14 and CO, and make sure they don't have any problem with
15 whatever is decided outside of the subcommittee.

16 Ms. Lewis suggests that in the broadest
17 consideration, as it relates to being in line with the FACA
18 law regarding the Committee and how it can operate and
19 involvement by the public, it doesn't take much to put a cc
20 to the Park to Dayna Hudson so that the Park can keep an
21 administrative record, because the public can't drop in and
22 engage on informal exchanges. And she doesn't think the law
23 expects that. But as long as the Park is cc'd, they can
24 have that available in the administrative record, if anybody
25 wanted to come and view that administrative record. Along

1 with that, Chairman Ogle will be cc'd, along with
2 Ms. Hudson.

3 Discussion was held regarding each subcommittee
4 keeping in touch with each other. There would be a monthly
5 report on what the committees are doing, what MK is doing
6 and what the Park Service is doing. And if something
7 unusual comes up then, of course, something would be sent
8 out separately for that occurrence. Ms. Lewis encourages
9 that anything that MK or the Park Service is looking to get
10 input and response on from the Committee during this
11 five-month period, should not be segregated to certain
12 groups of people; that discussion should go out to all
13 Committee members and always be open for all Committee
14 members to comment on.

15 However, those who have chosen to take on a
16 special look at certain specific areas, are encouraged to
17 always comment and be willing to even maybe go a little bit
18 further if necessary. She would not break those requests up
19 by those input groups but, rather, make the request always
20 to all Committee members, knowing they know what their
21 special interests are as well as their broad interest and
22 that the responsibility lie with the Committee member to
23 provide the input.

24 Mr. Jewitt trusts the people on the subcommittees
25 to follow the general direction. He would like to empower

1 the subcommittees a little bit. Mr. Jewitt, Ms. Mow and
2 Mr. Baker agree that the monthly meeting update is fine and
3 it is not necessary to have every E-mail received.

4 The consensus of the Committee is to review the
5 monthly updates and don't send every member of the Committee
6 every communication between subgroups or input groups.

7 On the discussion of meeting dates, monthly
8 updates will be given and draft reports. They will be
9 received by April 6th, keeping in mind that if they can be
10 gotten earlier than that they will, to give the Committee a
11 chance to look at them. And based on that, the next meeting
12 would be at East Glacier Lodge. After some discussion, the
13 meeting will be held from 8:00 a.m., May 31 with a possible
14 evening session, that includes a business session as well as
15 public comment period, and then end at noon, June 1st. The
16 public notice will include radio stations and newspapers.

17 Mr. Babb has a request that in order to make the
18 public meeting effective, if the public could have
19 available, prior to the public comment period, a
20 consolidation of comments available by the Park or MK
21 Centennial. Somehow pool everybody's comments together, and
22 also for an opportunity for the various Committee members to
23 see what other people said. These comments should be
24 available a week prior to the meeting.

25 Lowell Meznarch makes a motion that the draft

1 conceptual alternatives from MK Centennial be distributed to
2 the public when the Committee receives the drafts so that
3 they will have them in advance of the meeting to make
4 comment.

5 Ms. Lewis asks for a clarification on the word
6 "distributed," suggesting use of the word "available"
7 instead so there is not the expectation that the 7,000 on
8 the mailing list would each receive a draft. There is not
9 enough money to do that.

10 As there has not been second yet, Mr. Meznarch
11 amends his motion to "be made available" as opposed to "be
12 distributed." Paul Sliter seconds the motion.

13 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Any discussion on the motion?
14 All in favor?

15 (All Committee members raised hand.)

16 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Opposed?

17 (No raised hand.)

18 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Passed unanimously.

19 Mr. Dakin makes a couple of suggestions towards
20 the preparation of an agenda for the future meeting: One is
21 that the Committee encourage all members, after this meeting
22 is over while it's fresh in their mind, to critique it, to
23 give feedback to Suzann and the staff about things that
24 could have been done better, scheduled better, preparations
25 that could have been made better, so that the Committee can

1 hit the ground running at the next meeting.

2 Secondly, that there be some time, a half an hour
3 to an hour set aside early in the agenda of the next meeting
4 just for the members of the Committee to get things
5 clarified that they may not feel comfortable with before
6 they launch into the various topics of problem solving.
7 Because if that had been done this time, they might have
8 been able to get more on common ground early in the meeting.
9 In summary, better structure and more accomplishment next
10 time.

11 Mr. Ogle states an agenda will be sent to the
12 members in advance and they can make comments and changes if
13 necessary. The next meeting is going to be very crucial and
14 pivotal.

15 Mr. Jewitt makes sure that a large discussion
16 didn't get lost in the cracks. He asks for feedback from
17 the Park about how they're going to handle the issue that
18 was discussed earlier with regard to the
19 transportation/visitor use plan.

20 The agreement with MK stipulates a series of
21 deliverables. Almost all those deliverables are basically
22 studies. Regarding the transportation/visitor use plan,
23 there was a discussion about terminology of "short-term"
24 versus "long-term" in that subcommittee. It was decided
25 that that committee would limit their work to advising and

1 recommending input on the rehabilitation phase of the road
2 and the transportation/visitor use parameters around it.

3 At the same, time Fred informed the subcommittee
4 that the Park Service has the funds to produce a deliverable
5 Park transportation plan, and that that was a part of the
6 agreement. Because of that and because of the general
7 interest that is seen, both within the community and within
8 this group to have a discussion and have that deliverable
9 come forward at some point, which is a Park transportation
10 plan, Mr. Jewitt would like the Park Service to come to the
11 Committee with letting the subcommittee know what the
12 internal time table is for putting forth that transportation
13 plan and how the subcommittee may fit into it or what the
14 schedule is. It pertains directly to the agreement with MK.

15 Mr. Babb agrees to do that.

16 CHAIRMAN OGLE: We need to move on to the
17 public comment. For the benefit of the Committee, our
18 public comment period goes from 3:30 to 5:00. I don't know
19 if the public comment will go that long, but we need to be
20 available for public comment that long. And if we have time
21 to take up any more Committee business after the public
22 comments that are on the list have been completed, we can do
23 that.

24 We do have a few people who have signed up to make
25 public comment. I can't tell if this person has cancelled

1 or not.

2 MS. HUDSON: The scribbly mark is cancelled,
3 but I do have her comment.

4 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Katherine Richter has left
5 her public comment with us. You'll make it part of the
6 record.

7 MS. HUDSON: Yes.

8 CHAIRMAN OGLE: The next person to speak is
9 George Kipp.

10 George, would you stand up, identify yourself and
11 who you represent, please, and then go ahead and address the
12 Committee.

13 MR. KIPP: My name is George Kipp. My Indian
14 name is Pita Wa-Ah-Stah, which means Eagleflag. I'm a
15 member of the Blackfeet tribe. I'm chair of the Blackfeet
16 Judicious Association.

17 I'm here to approach the Advisory Committee on two
18 important aspects, I think, that pertain to Blackfeet Nation
19 as a whole and to the Advisory Committee to give some
20 concern over the historical data.

21 That is first, I'd like to go over a little bit of
22 the historical aspects of the Park. I was reading the sign
23 up there, the National Park Service Organic Act for 1996.
24 And it was organized to preserve and protect the wildlife
25 and habitat and so forth.

1 We, as the Blackfeet Nation, for thousands and
2 thousands of years were the ones that maintained not a
3 physical but more of a spiritual presence to this area. We
4 kept it in its pristine state. We were recognized as the
5 most conservative individuals, people, that there has been
6 on this earth for thousands of years. And the only changes
7 that has come is within the last hundred when we turned it
8 over to you guys. And we'll get to that. Not to you guys,
9 but to the Park when we sold it.

10 But the reason I'm here is first, is called the
11 Employment Preferences Act that belong within the Park. And
12 the first employment preferences that was based upon this
13 land, the first treaty that the Blackfeet made, is in 1855
14 and 1874. But the one I'd primarily like to discuss with
15 you is in 1888, the treaty in 1888, under Article III. I'm
16 just going to read some of the portions of the articles to
17 you. But I imagine after you're done, you'll have some
18 legal review. You'll ask several questions of your legal
19 representatives, the same as the Indians will be asking
20 legal review of theirs. And you'd like some substantial
21 opinions. But in 1888 when the boundary lines were
22 formed -- the boundary lines I'd like to read to you.

23 Whereupon, Mr. Kipp proceeds to read the legal
24 description of Glacier National Park; reported but not
25 transcribed.

1 The reason I'm reading you the description is that
2 because in 1888, the eastern half of Glacier National Park,
3 eastern part of Going-to-the-Sun highway, was part of the
4 designated Blackfeet Indian reservation. Okay; when we met
5 with our commissioners at that point in time, our elders,
6 there were certain things that they designated they wanted
7 on that reservation and they were given, and it was acted on
8 by Congress and passed.

9 Under Article III, now we're just talking about a
10 specific land base in 1888, I think, there was negotiated in
11 1887, ratified by Congress in 1888. Under Article III,
12 pretty much of it pertains to the land that we're talking
13 about now. But a portion of that it says in Article III,
14 "In consideration of the foregoing secession and
15 relinquishment of the United States hereby agrees to advance
16 and expend annually, for the period of ten years after
17 ratification of this agreement, under direction of the
18 Secretary of the Interior, for the Indians now attached to
19 and receiving rations" they talk about the Fort Peck which
20 they're getting because of dealing with other lands, Fort
21 Belknap, and then they talk about the Blackfeet. "...the
22 Blackfeet Agency, \$150,000; in purchase of cows, bulls, and
23 other stock, goods, clothing, subsistence, agricultural and
24 mechanical implements, in providing employees, in the
25 education of Indian children, procuring medicine and medical

1 attendance, in the care and support of the aged, sick and
2 infirm, and helpless orphans of said Indians, in the
3 erection of new agency and school buildings, mills, and
4 blacksmith, carpenter, and wagon shops as may be necessary,
5 in assisting the Indians to build houses and inclose their
6 farms, and in any other respect to promote their
7 civilization, comfort and improvement."

8 So anything that happens on this land at this
9 particular time we're talking about. Then it says
10 "Provided," and has "provided" underlined in the agreement,
11 "That in the employment of farmers, artisans, and laborers,
12 preference should in all cases be given to Indians residing
13 on reservation who are well qualified for such position."
14 That's Article III of that agreement of 1888. That's where
15 we say that we have employment preferences in the Park
16 because of the 1888 agreement. Okay.

17 Then in 1895, Commissioners Clements*, Grenell*,
18 Pollock* come, and they wanted to buy the mountain park from
19 the Indians. There's 22 pages of small type and 47 pages of
20 big type into this discussion that went on; okay? Anyway,
21 they agreed to sell that portion of the mountains that we
22 call the eastern half of Glacier National Park and Lewis and
23 Clark National Forest on the east side of the Continental
24 Divide from Birch Creek north to the Canadian divide for
25 one-and-one-half million dollars. Out of that become

1 Glacier National Park. But remember, there was stipulations
2 in the 1888 agreement. Okay.

3 In the 1895 agreement, I think that's what
4 everyone looked at when they first contemplated that, is
5 that the Blackfeet had specific reserved rights in there.
6 They reserved the right to access for hunting. Access was
7 described by Woodrow Kipp in the '70s when we was
8 wood-cutting. I was personally tried for hunting. Never
9 did really go to court because it was for not the best use,
10 it was only for test trial purposes. And they did not
11 decide upon that. Charles Lundberg* went for fishing,
12 Darrell Lundberg* went in too. But we did win a portion of
13 that, and it has never been tried yet. But it does say
14 within that article there are several areas where the
15 Indians requested preferences in employment. But primarily
16 1895 refers to the reservation area.

17 But the thing there is that they knew what
18 employment preferences there was. You have to project your
19 thought back to those days what native people were like.
20 The only employment on any -- in our area was agency and
21 school. There was the churches, there was the agency. That
22 was the only thing that provided any type of employment, so
23 they gathered the employment. In treaty law it stipulates
24 that the native people only relinquished the items that they
25 understood and how they understood it at that particular

1 time.

2 So when the commissioners come through in 1895,
3 they made another agreement. They'd walk the land, they
4 reserved specific rights which is in Article I. But Article
5 III they also reaffirmed it again. It was kind of in a
6 different little content, but it's still the same thing.
7 Article III of 1895 says, "It is agreed that the employment
8 of all agency and school employees preferenced in all cases
9 will be given to Indians residing on reservation who are
10 well qualified for such position." They talk about the
11 issuing of cattle and stuff. And then they also give some
12 other preferences. If you're pursuing the studies of making
13 your living as a preacher, you'd also get living as
14 preference in some cases.

15 So the argument comes up and arises that the
16 employment preference only pertains to the reservation. But
17 under Article IX of the 1895 agreement, Article IX, it
18 stipulates in there "The provisions of Article IX of this
19 agreement between the parties hereto made February 11th,
20 1887, are hereby continued in full force and effect as are
21 also all the provisions of said agreement not to conflict
22 with the provisions of this agreement." So what it says
23 that in 1895 they reaffirmed every Article that was in 1888
24 where the Indians reserve all employment preferences. I
25 know this is a legal question the Committee cannot answer.

1 You may examine it thoroughly but I don't think thoroughly
2 to the satisfaction of all the native people that's
3 involved.

4 Okay; in 1903 when they created Lewis and Clark
5 National Forest, by proclamation, Roosevelt stipulated in
6 there it would not infringe on any aborigine rights. In
7 1910 when they created Glacier National Park, it was also
8 reaffirmed in that language. So we, as Blackfeet, contend
9 that our rights in there are still secure.

10 Why do I bring this issue before you is that on
11 our reservation, we're at the economic highlights of our
12 period. We're down to 76 percent unemployment. Yes, that
13 is part of our reservation for thousands of years. Economic
14 gains or benefits that can be made by our people should be
15 offered willingly by those in charge and access that money.
16 If that money is considered agency money and agency in 1888
17 was considered the government, that's government money.
18 That's a government contract. Any type of waivers I don't
19 think are as strong as congressional act. And these things
20 have to be answered.

21 As far as us reserving the right to cut wood if
22 there's any clearing of forest with construction, I believe
23 that we should be entitled to be the first opportunity to
24 have that. We also reinforced these laws. In 1975 they had
25 the Indian Self Determination Act, Section 7B, which

1 stipulates that Indians have preference to employment on and
2 adjacent to their reservations. What is "adjacent"? We
3 definitely consider a part of our reservation, for that was
4 ours for thousands of years and borders us adjacent. So
5 these are legal questions that have to be answered by the
6 Committee, I believe, in order to reassure the contractor,
7 which I understand is union, that the Blackfoot tribe also
8 has their employment preference codes, their employment
9 services and they also impose Indian preference on the
10 reservation. I think, and this is a personal opinion, I
11 think goes over into the eastern portion of Glacier National
12 Park.

13 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Thank you, Mr. Kipp.
14 Mr. Kipp, how much more time do you have? We've been
15 confining people to five minutes and not much more than
16 this, and we have others that need to speak.

17 MR. KIPP: I just have one comment. I said
18 I'd make two comments.

19 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Okay.

20 MR. KIPP: Second comment is under your EIS
21 and all your studies and assessments, that the cultural
22 component should have been more adequately addressed and
23 more contact been made of the Blackfeet Nation for their
24 input, also for their availability and to possibly be part
25 of that assessment and that studies. I think that you'll

1 find availability of individuals there on our reservation
2 that this was denied.

3 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Thank you, Mr. Kipp.

4 Our next person who signed up is Sharlon Willows.

5 MS. WILLOWS: I'm sorry, I just had a couple
6 notes on section 10 of FACA last night, and I did not bring
7 it with me. I thought it said interested public should be
8 notified of meetings, and I've really had trouble finding
9 out about these meetings. I may have missed it, but this
10 week'S Hungry Horse News and Sunday and Monday Daily Inter
11 Lake made no mention of the meeting. And I suppose there
12 will be in the future, from listening to you, there's going
13 to be more timely and visible notification to the public.

14 And my second observation from today is, it seems
15 to me the focus of this whole issue really is a shifting
16 from, quote, "best available technology to mitigate impacts
17 to the road" to a focus on "traffic management." And I
18 guess I'm not sure where that's -- just that's my
19 observation.

20 And number three, I've attempted to be an
21 interested public, and only now hear about the
22 February/March meeting of this Committee meeting. And,
23 again, how do we get involved in the information exchange
24 and how do we get access to MKC's monthly reports, the April
25 6 draft report, et cetera?

1 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Ms. Willows, just to make
2 sure the record is clear here, I'd like to refresh your
3 recollection. You did give public comment to us at the
4 February and March meeting. And our next one is May 31st
5 and June 1st of next year, just so you're knowing.

6 MS. WILLOWS: I was? I was thinking it was
7 the last February and March.

8 CHAIRMAN OGLE: It was. You were there.
9 Thank you.

10 MS. WILLOWS: Thank you; pardon me.

11 CHAIRMAN OGLE: And our next speaker is John
12 Frederick.

13 MR. FREDERICK: My name is John Frederick of
14 Polebridge. I will be brief. I'm representing the North
15 Fork Improvement Association, which has an interest in
16 keeping the North Fork Road at the western edge of Glacier
17 Park well maintained. For the 21 years I've lived at
18 Polebridge, the Park has used the North Fork Road as their
19 main artery to the Polebridge ranger station and the North
20 Fork of Glacier.

21 During the period that the Going-to-the-Sun Road
22 is being repaired, more people may choose to visit the North
23 Fork by the county road rather than endure construction on
24 the Sun Road. Now that Flathead County is strapped for
25 money, and the North Fork Road is not being well maintained,

1 it is an excellent time during the Sun Road construction for
2 the Park to help with maintaining the county North Fork
3 Road.

4 One way, that may not involve this Committee, is
5 to use some of the Park's equipment during peak tourist
6 season after the Sun Road is plowed out could be used to
7 grade the North Fork Road. Another way is to budget a
8 modest amount of money in the appropriations for the Sun
9 Road repair to keep the North Fork Road graded properly
10 during the time of reconstruction, as part of community
11 involvement or keeping an alternative route open or whatever
12 is appropriate to make it work.

13 I would like to read part of a letter to
14 Superintendent Suzann Lewis from Richard Wackrow, president
15 of the North Fork Improvement Association.

16 "To reiterate the concerns of the association:

17 "Construction on the Sun Road would divert traffic
18 to the North Fork Road, which is now receiving marginal
19 maintenance from the county. We think that traffic will be
20 diverted to two portions of the road - from Canyon Creek (at
21 the end of the pavement out of Columbia Falls) to Camas
22 Creek Road, and between Camas and Polebridge.

23 "We ask that before construction begins, the
24 Citizens Advisory Committee do a thorough traffic analysis
25 and that it devise methods by which additional traffic on

1 the North Fork Road can be minimized.

2 "In this same regard, we ask that Glacier Park
3 seek federal funding to maintain those two portions of the
4 road while they are subject to increase traffic
5 displacement."

6 Do you have any questions?

7 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Any questions for
8 Mr. Frederick?

9 MR. JACKSON: In our previous meeting, there
10 was some testimony on the North Fork Road, and the sentiment
11 presented by that person was that we shouldn't be proposing
12 to pave the North Fork Road which, you know, I don't think
13 this Committee has much focus on any of the North Fork Road,
14 actually. Although I think we have to recognize that any of
15 these traffic management things, like you've talked about,
16 will, in fact, possibly influence traffic flows on other
17 roads such as the North Fork Road or along through Essex and
18 whatnot. And so I hope that we have the capability of
19 understanding those changes, and I'm not sure we do yet.

20 MR. FREDERICK: Well, it's an option that I
21 present for this Committee. There's three other North
22 Forkers here that may wish to say something.

23 CHAIRMAN OGLE: That's all of the people who
24 have signed up to make public comment. Is there anyone else
25 here in the audience who would like to make public comment

1 to the Committee who have not yet spoken?

2 Sir.

3 MR. HOILAND: I'm Duke Hoiland from Trail
4 Creek on the North Fork. I'd just like to support what John
5 Frederick has said. I think usually what we hear in the
6 public is a silent or a noisy minority. And I think the
7 silent majority in the North Fork is totally outraged over
8 what we had to travel on this summer. And I think that if
9 the Park puts more traffic on that road without increased
10 maintenance, that we'll be adding fire -- or fuel to a fire
11 that's already out of control. There are a lot of people
12 who are outraged on what conditions we had to drive over
13 between May and now. Last grading was in May. The upper
14 North Fork is still not graded, probably won't be graded for
15 another two weeks. We're outraged.

16 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Thank you.

17 Anyone else who would like to comment or hasn't
18 had a chance to do so?

19 Sir.

20 MR. GRIMALDI: I was just writing it out. I
21 hadn't said anything previously. Bob Grimaldi.

22 Are there any plans on the part of the Park
23 Service to perhaps use the inside North Fork Road during
24 this period and thereby divert traffic, both your Park
25 Service vehicles, and encourage the public to travel that

1 road to go to Bowman and Kintla rather than turn them off on
2 the North Fork Road as Mr. Frederick and Mr. Hoiland has
3 said is in terrible condition and getting worse daily?
4 Would you use your resources in the Park? That would help a
5 lot. I'm wondering if you could consider that and perhaps
6 do something about running the traffic up that way. Thank
7 you.

8 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Thank you.

9 Paul.

10 MR. SLITER: I had the opportunity to travel
11 the North Fork Road on Friday of last week, and I know
12 exactly what these people are talking about. And the gravel
13 portion of the road, which is all gravel from Polebridge to
14 the border is -- I'm not sure even a good grade job would
15 fix it because the cobble, which is the base of the road,
16 has come through to the surface to the point where it is
17 actually like driving down a cobblestone road. It's almost
18 unbearable. And I think, for one, that this Committee ought
19 to consider surrounding roads, you know, the roads
20 surrounding the Park when we start to discuss mitigation of
21 the Sun Road project.

22 And I'm not going to make any motions, but I think
23 that the people that live in the North Fork and the people
24 that recreate in the North Fork both suffer due to use by
25 Park people. And I have to say that I think that the inside

1 North Fork Road is worse between Fish Creek and Polebridge.
2 I've not driven it for quite a while because I nearly
3 wrecked my truck traveling it. And so we might consider
4 some work on the inside North Fork Road to help mitigate
5 some of that traffic, once this project gets started.

6 CHAIRMAN OGLE: All right. Anybody else who
7 hasn't spoken who would like to address the Committee?

8 MS. WILLOWS: Could I just clarify that
9 mistake? I got so confused, I didn't have a chance to check
10 the calendar and it just seemed like longer ago or
11 something.

12 CHAIRMAN OGLE: No problem.

13 MS. WILLOWS: It still wasn't clear on when
14 is the public involvement for this next meeting?

15 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Well, we'll have or three
16 public involvement sessions like we did this time. We'll
17 probably have one in the morning and one in the evening, one
18 the following morning. We'll have at least one public
19 involvement session every half-day session, I'd say.

20 Suzann.

21 MS. LEWIS: Maybe to clarify just as this
22 meeting has been open to the public, so are all of our
23 future meetings. And then we'll have specific time where we
24 take public comment.

25 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Tony, did you want to say

1 something?

2 MR. JEWETT: Just a couple. One was a
3 question but also, you know, Mary laid out open houses we're
4 going to be doing, which is also an opportunity for the
5 public involvement, as we go through the process for each
6 one of these stages, Sharlon.

7 I had a question I was struck by when Mr. Kipp was
8 talking, about the fact that I remember in our initial
9 meeting both Don and Tom had talked about, as one of their
10 considerations, employment opportunities for Native
11 Americans through this process. And yet we didn't talk
12 about it at all at this meeting.

13 And I'm just curious, is there a nexus between the
14 deliberations of this Committee and how employment
15 opportunities play out, say, in terms of rehabilitation on
16 the road? Or is that outside of the purview of our work?

17 MS. TOWNSEND: Tony, while as a whole group
18 we haven't talked about employment opportunities, within the
19 socioeconomic group we have talked about business
20 opportunities. And both at our meeting on the east side and
21 at our meeting on the west side, specifically, business
22 opportunities for the Blackfeet and the Salish Kootenai came
23 up as an important concern. So it is being addressed within
24 the socioeconomic component of the construction.

25 MR. JEWETT: Is it within the scope of what

1 this Committee will consider and make recommendations on in
2 the outcome of our technical report?

3 MS. TOWNSEND: We -- when we're developing a
4 mitigation strategy to deal with the Going-to-the-Sun Road
5 reconstruction, we will be -- I'm rather confident we'll be
6 focusing, in part, on what employment opportunities or
7 business investment opportunities there will be,
8 specifically for the Blackfeet and the Salish Kootenai.

9 MR. WHITE: I think we're not talking
10 opportunity, I think we're talking federal law that has to
11 be followed in treaties and law that we have to address and,
12 in fact, determine if, in fact, it is a requirement within
13 the employment opportunities that we're talking Indian
14 preference being given now with opportunities in the Park.
15 I think Mr. Kipp brought that up according to the treaties,
16 that this is law that the tribes and the federal government
17 have signed as treaties.

18 MS. TOWNSEND: I can't respond right now,
19 Don, to the legal aspects of what George brought up earlier
20 today. My focus is on the mitigation strategies.

21 MR. WHITE: I think the recommendation was to
22 get legal review of this, particularly these treaties, and
23 get a determination.

24 MR. BABB: To answer that -- and part of the
25 scope, just like Jean said, the legal interpretation, as of

1 now, is not part of MK's scope.

2 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I think it goes without
3 saying that any contractor's going to have to follow the
4 law. So we don't have any resources with which to do legal
5 research. We're not contractors. We're not going to be
6 hiring anybody. But I think it's incumbent upon the
7 contractors to make sure that they follow the law. And we
8 don't have any reason to think they wouldn't. And I don't
9 think we would really -- I think it's beyond the scope of
10 our Committee to really deal with that.

11 David.

12 MR. JACKSON: Yes. I might add that I do
13 know that Brace Haden of Glacier National Park has
14 recommended that the Park has entered into some kind of
15 agreement to research the legal status between the
16 Blackfeet, in particular, and the Park. And that I think
17 that if that were to be pushed as a priority, it could be
18 done outside the direct purview of this Committee but could
19 be streamlined and brought into alignment with the report of
20 this Committee and would help a lot.

21 MR. KIPP: I have a question, please. He
22 mentioned a socioeconomic committee? Was that a
23 subcommittee within this Committee?

24 MS. TOWNSEND: There's socioeconomic
25 committee within this Committee. And Don's a part of that.

1 MR. KIPP: Who is the chairman of that?

2 MS. TOWNSEND: Linda is.

3 MR. KIPP: I believe that there is some legal
4 questions that need to be answered, but Don reaffirmed, it
5 is some legal questions, some legal rights that native
6 people retained from treaty days. We're looking at over a
7 hundred some years ago. But under the socioeconomic
8 committee is socioeconomic committee to determine the
9 socioeconomic benefits of those that are to be gainful
10 through employment, businesses, as you say? And I believe
11 that this Committee could ask for that legal review to
12 expedite that, and I do believe that it is not out of the
13 realm of this Committee to question that thoroughly.
14 Because if the Blackfeet tribe imposes an injunction, a
15 federal injunction, it stops everything, consequently, your
16 committee.

17 So to resolve issues nowadays, it's better to go
18 with negotiations before litigation, to answer questions
19 prior to reaction. So I believe it's in the scope of this
20 Committee to recommend it and request it, that a legal
21 review stirs opinion, be developed jointly or actually just
22 having them start talk with the native people about these
23 rights. It is within the Committee's scope.

24 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Very well.

25 That concludes our public comment period. And we

1 do -- we'll be available here, I guess, for a while longer
2 in case anyone else shows up. And if there is any other
3 matter you need -- the Committee would like to bring up in
4 terms of Committee business. We can deal with that.

5 Dave.

6 MR. JACKSON: Yeah. I would like to ask the
7 Park Service to report how they've budgeted the million
8 dollars for this Committee's advice and your expenditure. I
9 heard something about the size of the contract with
10 MK Centennial. I'd like to know how it's broken down. I'd
11 like to know what you estimate the cost of serving meetings
12 for this Committee and, I presume, how the rest of the money
13 is going to be spent or, in fact, has already been spent.
14 That does dovetail to remarks of Paul Sliter's from the
15 previous meeting, and it would help us kind of get tracked.

16 MR. BABB: We can provide that to everyone.
17 We can do that.

18 MR. JACKSON: Can you do that now?

19 MR. BABB: In general terms, I can -- I have
20 the expenditures. Give me a second to find it here. Why
21 don't you go ahead and go to the next question.

22 MS. PAHL: I was listening to comments about
23 the North Fork Road, and I actually drove that for the
24 experience in a meaningful way. But when I first listened
25 to your comments, I was thinking, you know, people probably

1 won't go on that road unless we suggest they do, which is
2 something we talked about, especially when there's a lot of
3 work going on on the west side. We all know there will be
4 more people going down Highway 2.

5 But let's say one of our alternate visitor
6 experiences that we recommend is Well, there's other parts
7 of the Park you can visit on the west side, and all of a
8 sudden we are sending traffic along those roads. So while
9 the Park Service, I doubt, can use federal money on the road
10 that's in the county, we might, as long as we're sending
11 letters, maybe send a letter to the county commissioners or
12 maybe Montana Department of Transportation and suggest they
13 make it a priority to make some of those improvements along
14 the road, because it may, in fact, receive more visitation
15 as people are looking for other places on the west side of
16 the Park to travel to when they're finding it more difficult
17 to access the west side of the Going-to-the-Sun Road. So I
18 don't know if that's a motion. I guess that's a motion.

19 CHAIRMAN OGLE: What was the motion?

20 MS. PAHL: I think the motion would be for
21 this Committee to send a letter to the county commissioners,
22 but also I think to the Montana Department of Transportation
23 to suggest that they make it a priority to make road
24 improvements along the outside North Fork Road in
25 conjunction with plans to rehabilitate the Going-to-the-Sun

1 Road, which may indeed send more traffic along that road.

2 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Hear Barb's motion. A
3 second? Is there a second to the motion? Dies for lack of
4 a second.

5 Sorry, Barb.

6 Paul.

7 MR. SLITER: If I could, I want to talk just
8 a little bit about the local issues that surround the North
9 Fork Road and --

10 MR. JEWETT: Is there another perspective,
11 Paul?

12 MR. SLITER: Well, there is another
13 perspective. And we heard from Dave Hadden and we heard
14 from Cesar Hernandez at the last meeting about how they
15 don't want anything to happen to the North Fork Road; okay?

16 The National Park Service and their guests, the
17 touring public, use the road. But I think that for this
18 committee to write the Flathead County Commissioners and
19 tell them to fix the road opens up a can of worms that you
20 don't want to be a part of. The county commissioners know
21 that the road needs fixed. Congressman Hill knows that the
22 road needs fixed. And we all know that the traffic that's
23 going to take place as a result of the Going-to-the-Sun
24 project is going to have a significant impact on the North
25 Fork Road.

1 But there is a huge political fight going on right
2 now with regard to that road. And I think that if it's
3 anyone's job to put some resources forward, that it ought to
4 be, you know, the federal government. Because I think that
5 it's the Park Service's -- well, it's not the Park Service,
6 but it's the people who are using the Park the most -- and
7 the county doesn't have any money; that's what they're
8 saying. The -- you know, the project that was proposed by
9 Congressman Hill has been chastised up one side and down the
10 other because it involved paving. You know, some people are
11 going to say the worse that road is, the better, because we
12 don't want any people up there. Well, the people that live
13 up there need a road to travel up and down on. But I'm not
14 at all sure that it ought to be this Committee's job to
15 write anybody a letter telling them that they ought to do
16 something about it.

17 If we're going to create an impact on that road,
18 then we ought to do something about it, not write anybody a
19 letter.

20 MS. PAHL: How do you think we're going to do
21 that?

22 MR. SLITER: I think through the mitigation
23 money that becomes available, if it comes available, I think
24 some of that money ought to be used on that road, yes. But
25 I think that that ought to be something that we undertake

1 and not start pointing fingers at anybody else on who ought
2 to be doing the fixing.

3 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Lowell.

4 MR. MEZNARCH: I would be remiss not to
5 mention the east side's Highway 49, referred to as the
6 Looking Glass Road, which is not a county road, which is
7 mostly paved, and is presently maintained through a
8 cooperative agreement with the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the
9 Montana Department of Transportation, Glacier County. And,
10 in a similar fashion, that road would most likely be
11 impacted by this rehabilitation of the Going-to-the-Sun
12 Road.

13 MR. HOILAND: I don't understand why we have
14 to drive on a pile of rocks because a few people like
15 Hernandez and Hadden say that animals in the North Fork are
16 more important than the people. Now, I don't know how I can
17 summarize this with few words. And now the only reason why
18 they're winning the battle now is because they always
19 threaten to sue and we don't. But, you know, we do have the
20 wherewithal now, where there are organizations that would
21 take our case. So we could say the same thing. We can sue
22 to get that road. We don't need a paved road, and we will
23 meet these people halfway. All we want is a reasonable
24 road.

25 MR. DAKIN: Point of order, Randy. Did the

1 motion die for lack of a second?

2 MS. PAHL: Yeah.

3 MS. PAHL: It died real bad.

4 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Susie, did you have
5 something?

6 MS. BURCH: I was just wondering, does the
7 Park ever grade any of those roads? It's not in the Park
8 Service budget to grade those roads?

9 MS. LEWIS: Just as a point of clarification,
10 the roads are outside the federal boundary, and we're
11 prohibited by law from expecting federal funds to maintain a
12 road outside the boundary. If we were to get a piece of
13 legislation from Congress directing the National Park
14 Service to do that and appropriate the funds to do it, then
15 that changes it. But the very nature of the Park boundaries
16 precludes us from spending federal funds outside our
17 boundaries. So that's a sort of a given that we have.

18 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Fred, are you ready to
19 respond to that question?

20 MR. BABB: Yes. In essence, on the money
21 that we obligated in regards of MK Centennial contract,
22 these are the dollar figures. First we did a \$30,000 task
23 order. That was for the first Committee meeting as well as
24 miscellaneous charges. In other words, so we could get the
25 job rolling. They didn't use all that for the Committee

1 meeting. That money has been obligated and paid, more or
2 less. That task is done.

3 The second part is what we call the engineering
4 review, which is looking at the documents, talking to
5 people, et cetera. The negotiated amount was a 92,565.
6 Now, they haven't asked -- not all payment has been made on
7 this part of the contract. So not all that is done. It's
8 still being worked on. The second one, which is the big one
9 that Craig and I were talking about, is the engineering,
10 transportation and visitor use as well as the socioeconomic,
11 total 700,106; all right? So that comes down to \$823,132
12 (sic); all right?

13 Now, you have to subtract the other funding
14 source, which Suzann brought out, where we obligated 205,000
15 out of another account to pay for part of this. So you
16 subtract that, and we've spent about \$618,000 under contract
17 out of the million dollars. All right so far? We've spent,
18 thus far -- now this is approximate because we're balancing
19 our books at the end of the year to make sure of the amount,
20 so this is a general number -- but it's about \$180,000 that
21 we've spent so far. That might be different when we get the
22 books balanced by October 1st.

23 MR. O'QUINN: You mean by that, direct spend?

24 MR. BABB: Meaning by the Park Service, the
25 Committees, anything that we've done that are not

1 MK Centennial related. That's what those charges are.
2 Which leaves us, plus or minus, around \$200,000, if all our
3 figures are correct. And we'll know these last two figures,
4 you know, in a matter of about a week, the end of next week.

5 Now, one other thing, to go back to this then on
6 the work that we're talking, just so everybody knows,
7 there's the 205 for transportation/visitor use. We've also
8 obligated through MK, 80,106 also out of another fund source
9 for the cultural landscape; all right? Which totals the
10 285. So if you put the 285 to what I say, the 618 on the
11 other side is what we've done.

12 There have been -- although this doesn't relate to
13 the Committee, there have been other charges to both of
14 these by NPS, both in the Denver service center as well here
15 in the Park. But this is the money we had obligated. The
16 total figures we got here are 225, and I believe this is 105
17 that we got as a full amount.

18 MS. BURCH: Now, on the more recent -- what's
19 that thing called, draft project agreement, Park and public
20 staff participation; Advisory Committee and staff support;
21 those two together, which I presume is NPS -- mostly NPS
22 money, that was budgeted 265.

23 MR. BABB: This is on the project agreement
24 you're going through, now?

25 MS. BURCH: Right. Because then you're

1 saying you've spent about 180. So what I'm seeing is you're
2 two-thirds the of the way through the money we budgeted.

3 MR. BABB: What we did is we set up those
4 original budgets in the March time frame. Craig and I went
5 back and we said Okay, what is our scenario and what we
6 think the budget should be. We need to actually augment
7 those budgets now with what we've actually obligated and
8 what we spent. They were done last May, the last revision
9 we did on those, and some of these negotiations took place
10 after that. As well some of the scopes got changed
11 slightly.

12 MS. BURCH: But we're going to spend all our
13 money. It seems to me we're going to be over budget, is
14 what I'm thinking. Because it doesn't look to me like the
15 engineering and socioeconomic study what's really been done.

16 MR. BABB: In other words, those figures you
17 had were done early. These figures now relate to the scope
18 of services that you have before you. So if we add things
19 to the scope, then we have to change that. But these
20 figures include most all the things that are in that project
21 agreement of what we were going to do, except for certain
22 things like Jean mentioned where we've deferred one part of
23 the socioeconomic to when we move into the EIS. There's a
24 few things like that. But we're viewing this as, you know,
25 we're in pretty good shape unless we change the scope.

1 MS. BURCH: We have a functioning budget
2 then.

3 MR. BABB: Yes. And we're monitoring it in
4 the Park.

5 MR. JACKSON: Was GPS part of the million
6 dollar expenditure?

7 MR. BABB: We're doing -- on GPS we were
8 fortunate enough to work with Federal highway, and we
9 secured additional funding for that and we augmented that
10 with some funding that we had in the Park. So, in essence,
11 that doesn't show in these figures. And we didn't take it
12 out of the million dollars at all.

13 Any other questions on budget? I'm sorry.

14 MR. SLITER: Maybe for either you or Craig or
15 maybe a combination of the two, I know that with engineering
16 and a project timeline, a lot of your expense is -- for
17 engineering and planning comes kind of at the beginning of
18 the whole project. And that expense starts to go down. But
19 I also see what Susie is talking about.

20 From what's been paid out and when's been
21 produced, now, has anything been -- of the 700,106, has that
22 all been paid out already?

23 MR. BABB: Nothing's been paid.

24 MR. SLITER: It's not been paid.

25 MR. BABB: And only a small portion of the 92

1 has been paid out.

2 MR. SLITER: But it has been spent?

3 MR. BABB: No, no.

4 MR. SLITER: It's been obligated.

5 MR. BABB: It's sitting in the coffer in the
6 National Park Service and Craig submits the billings. And
7 when those billings are submitted, I make sure that the
8 work's done and then we pay that amount.

9 MR. SLITER: I wanted to make sure that was
10 clear that it hasn't -- the money's not gone yet. I mean,
11 it's obligated, but it's not yet spent.

12 MR. BABB: Right. Now, on this particular
13 project, the big amount, we base that on percentages and
14 deliverables. But if I remember right, it's like 30 or 25
15 percent. Then when we get the draft in April, we pay up to
16 60 percent, and the final is like 90 percent.

17 MR. SLITER: Paid on production.

18 MR. BABB: On production and satisfaction.
19 So there's checks and balances there.

20 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Any other questions for Fred?

21 MR. BABB: We'll put something in type and
22 send it out.

23 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Will.

24 MR. BROOKE: This isn't a question for Fred,
25 if it makes any difference, Mr. Chairman.

1 CHAIRMAN OGLE: A different topic.

2 Any other questions for Fred then?

3 MR. SLITER: The final contract that was
4 negotiated and settled on, can members of the Committee have
5 access to that?

6 MR. BABB: That's what we're going to
7 provide. We're going to get a contract from Ed Tafoya, and
8 we're going to verify that, hopefully this week, that we
9 have the most up-to-date version, and then we're going to
10 put a bundle of all these contracts and either E-mail it to
11 everybody or put it in a packet and send to you.

12 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Will?

13 MR. BROOKE: At the end of yesterday's
14 discussion about public involvement, I raised the question
15 about getting the survey out to people other than those that
16 were here visiting Montana and suggested that we use the
17 Montana tourism database when people are requesting
18 information because they want to visit Montana and that was
19 a likely source. And I'd like to push that and add a little
20 further and stronger and make a formal request if not a
21 motion, and make a motion that we direct the Park Service
22 and MK to pursue that avenue of soliciting additional data
23 on the survey utilizing that database.

24 MR. DAKIN: I don't think we can direct that.
25 We can advise them.

1 MR. BROOKE: Recommend; you're right. I so
2 amend.

3 CHAIRMAN OGLE: To amend your motion that we
4 recommend to the National Park Service that -- what's the
5 motion?

6 MR. BROOKE: That they utilize the Montana
7 Travel database, wherein people requesting information about
8 Montana, they utilize that database to sample people with
9 the survey that they are presently handing out to those
10 persons that are visiting Glacier National Park.

11 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Suzann.

12 MS. LEWIS: Jean, can you provide some
13 clarification? Have we not closed the sampling on that
14 survey?

15 MS. TOWNSEND: If I could answer that -- and
16 partly I know I can't make a friendly amendment because I'm
17 not on the Committee. But if I understand the gist of what
18 Will wants, it is -- which I parenthetically think is a
19 great idea -- is to use the database from Travel Montana.
20 They have a list of people that have expressed interest in
21 going to Glacier. To use that and query them through a
22 mail-out-mail-back survey instrument that asks a number of
23 the questions that we did in the visitor use survey.

24 But literally, Will, to use the same survey
25 instrument isn't quite appropriate because the circumstance

1 is different. So if we could loosen it a little bit to
2 query those people with a similar set of questions to get at
3 your point, I think that would work a little better than
4 literally using the same document because, yes, we've
5 closed.

6 MS. LEWIS: And that's within your scope?

7 MS. TOWNSEND: No, that would be an amendment
8 to my scope.

9 MS. LEWIS: And that would require additional
10 funding for which there's no source at this time.

11 MR. BROOKE: If it wasn't in the scope, then
12 it certainly should have been. Because we repeatedly raised
13 that issue. That was one of the problems with the original
14 data and one of the reasons we challenged the Park Service
15 plan, that we were concerned about the sampling data because
16 the sampling people that were here. So if we did this
17 survey again of the people that were visiting and didn't
18 include it within the scope, then I respectfully suggest
19 that we do something to rectify that. Because that was one
20 of the issues that was repeatedly raised by the public at
21 the public hearings on this matter.

22 And as to the suggestion, I think that's fine.
23 Because it probably is appropriate to have different
24 questions. But still, you know, one of the primary issues
25 that I'm interested in is how people that have not yet

1 decided to come to Montana but are thinking about it are
2 going to make the decision when you tell them about road
3 closures, road restrictions, travel restrictions and those
4 kinds of issues.

5 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Linda -- sorry; Tony.

6 MR. JEWETT: Will, could you refresh me with
7 what was the data information you wanted to get out of this
8 expanded data pool, so I can remember?

9 MR. BROOKE: Sure. One of the things that
10 came up when this discussion began way back when when the
11 draft management plan came out was, there was considerable
12 hang your hat on the fact that many people said they would
13 still come to Glacier, even if the road was closed, one way
14 or the other. And we had serious concerns about that answer
15 and that question given to people who were already here and
16 had seen Glacier and said Yeah, I'd do anything to come back
17 here. Because they're here, they've seen it, they've
18 enjoyed it. We think they are going to have a different
19 response to it.

20 So one of the things -- I think there's all sorts
21 of information that you can find out about the people who
22 haven't come here yet, haven't visited here yet, that are
23 just thinking about it. You can get all sorts of data out
24 of them that's going to affect, I think, ultimately, what
25 kind of restrictions that might be more palatable or not

1 palatable. Because people might respond that are out in
2 Minnesota in their living room trying to make a decision
3 about whether to come here, that if they're told there's
4 only going to be travel on the road three days a week,
5 they'll say We'll wait until the construction is done, we'll
6 plan our vacation in Glacier in three years from now, we'll
7 go to the Everglades instead. That's the kind of
8 information that I think that the people that were raising
9 this issue were after. And we're not satisfied that the
10 original surveys covered it.

11 MR. BABB: This is just a suggestion. If the
12 Committee agrees with Will that that's really a good idea
13 and want that, suppose you were to recommend that and then
14 the Park Service, along with MK Centennial, investigate
15 ideas on how we can accomplish that, recognizing that we
16 have to look at our budget and we have to look at other
17 means, et cetera. But we see whether there's a way to do
18 what Will suggested.

19 MR. DAKIN: But it would be a different
20 survey; right? I mean, the one that was drawn up was You're
21 already here and what did you do while you were here.

22 MR. BROOKE: Uh-huh.

23 MR. DAKIN: So we'd have to start from
24 scratch.

25 MR. BROOKE: Well, I don't know about

1 scratch.

2 MR. DAKIN: Or take a portion of it.

3 MR. BROOKE: I think that the people in
4 charge of this particular part of the study know very well
5 what the questions are that should be asked. And certainly
6 based on the public comment that has been provided
7 beforehand, know what it is they need to query about. But
8 even in the absence of that, I would think that this
9 Committee and the Park Service and the consultants would
10 want to know that information.

11 MR. DAKIN: So you want to restate the
12 motion?

13 MR. BROOKE: Sure. It is to make a
14 recommendation -- new motion. Withdraw the old.

15 It is to recommend to the Park Service that the
16 consulting firm be directed to develop appropriate survey
17 and utilize the appropriate database to query individuals
18 that are not here in the state already but planning to come
19 to the state, and especially Glacier, to determine
20 their -- to determine the effect of travel restriction on
21 Going-to-the-Sun Road in their planning a vacation to
22 Glacier.

23 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Okay; second the motion?

24 MR. SLITER: Second.

25 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Discussion?

1 MS. HUDSON: Can Mary read it back, please?

2 MS. ANSOTEGUI: Will Brooke made a motion to
3 recommend that MK and NPS use Travel Montana's database to
4 do a mail-out survey to those who have not traveled to
5 Glacier National Park asking similar appropriate questions
6 as the first survey.

7 MR. BROOKE: I think I used the word
8 "appropriate," "appropriate database."

9 MR. ALLISON: Okay; "utilize the appropriate
10 database."

11 MR. BROOKE: But I think Travel Montana would
12 be an excellent source, because it's obvious that people are
13 requesting information about traveling in Montana.

14 MS. KREMENIK: Could we say "distribute"
15 instead of "mail out"?

16 CHAIRMAN OGLE: All right.

17 Do you have the motion now, Mary?

18 MS. ANSOTEGUI: Will Brooke made a
19 recommendation to MK and NPS utilize the appropriate
20 database to distribute a survey to those who have not
21 traveled to Glacier National Park asking similar appropriate
22 questions as the first survey.

23 MS. HUDSON: How about to distribute a
24 visitor --

25 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Why don't you just say

1 survey.

2 Further discussion on the motion? Linda's had her
3 hand up for a while.

4 MS. ANDERSON: I just wanted to add to that
5 that Glacier Country also has a database which is separate
6 from Travel Montana's. And it's available in two different
7 ways whether electronic or your standard mail.

8 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I think the motion has
9 deleted the Montana.

10 MS. MOE: It just says "appropriate
11 database."

12 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Barb.

13 MS. PAHL: If there isn't funding for it to
14 happen with MK, is there any survey you're doing already
15 Linda, or the University of Montana, where they could add a
16 couple of questions that we could get at this?

17 MS. ANDERSON: I think it's something that we
18 could definitely see how easily -- I mean, we're already
19 asking questions right now --

20 MS. PAHL: There you go. So couldn't you
21 just add it so that just typed having MK do it, I think the
22 point is we need to get the data.

23 MR. BROOKE: Except there becomes a
24 credibility issue, this data versus that data, if there's
25 conflict. And I would rather see it put out and deciphered

1 by the same group.

2 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Further discussion on Will's
3 motion?

4 David.

5 MR. JACKSON: I think, in principal, it's a
6 good idea. I think if you limit it to people who have
7 already expressed an interest and apparently not come, you
8 won't be advertising to potential visitors that the road
9 might be closed along different alternatives. And given all
10 the mitigation stuff we're doing, I suppose we'd argue that
11 that might not be good PR. So I think it ought to be done
12 carefully.

13 MR. BROOKE: Well, we've already done some of
14 that in the first survey.

15 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Tony.

16 MR. JEWETT: Will, I think that whatever
17 information we can gather about people's attitudes, whether
18 indifferent or not, is going to be important and helpful.
19 At the same time, I think there's a half-empty half-full cup
20 argument that we can make about the instrument questionnaire
21 that we send out, if we decide to do this.

22 Certainly within the scope, Jean is identifying
23 innovative marketing strategies to be developed. And I
24 think those strategies need to go out to that sector of the
25 general public that is interested in coming here. And so if

1 we do send the survey out, rather than using it simply as a
2 measurement of how half empty the cup will be if they don't
3 come, how we might be able to attract people who are
4 thinking of coming, given the circumstances of this
5 reconstruct to enrich the data. So if you do send it out, I
6 would like to see questions on there that look for marketing
7 messages and tools to attract people to come.

8 MR. BROOKE: And in that regard, I think
9 that's a great idea, Tony. Because as we both know, in
10 politics, you can use push questions to see if you shape an
11 issue differently, how people will respond to that. And I
12 think that's very true in this case. That if you said If I
13 were to tell you X, would you be more likely or less likely
14 to travel Going-to-the-Sun Road of Glacier? If I told you Y
15 would you be more likely or less likely? So I think that's
16 an excellent idea. But that's generally in the motion
17 to -- that's left up to them.

18 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Any further discussion on
19 Will's motion?

20 Barb.

21 MS. PAHL: So Will, are you saying that
22 unless the questionnaire is done by MK, you don't think it's
23 a -- versus there's no money to do it? An alternative
24 essentially.

25 MR. BROOKE: Oh, I think there's money to do

1 it. I think they've got some authority left within their
2 budget to do this, if they want to do it. I'm not saying I
3 might take all my marbles and go home and not play the game
4 if they don't play my game, I'm not saying that. But I
5 really don't think it's a good idea to put this Committee in
6 a position where we've got competing data out there -- or
7 not competing data, but different people doing different
8 things. Because I think that the same person's going to
9 structure this and be able to defend the questions
10 uniformly. And I just don't think it's a good idea to put
11 the Park Service or this Committee or the public in that
12 position.

13 MR. SLITER: Call the question.

14 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Question's been called.

15 MS. MOE: Second.

16 CHAIRMAN OGLE: All those in favor of Will's
17 motion say aye.

18 (All Committee members respond aye.)

19 CHAIRMAN OGLE: All those opposed; nay.

20 (No response.)

21 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Motion passed.

22 Is there any further business?

23 Paul.

24 MR. SLITER: I'd like to query the Committee
25 with -- I guess with regard to an issue we heard during the

1 public comment, and that's the Indian preference hiring.
2 I'm thinking about our chief legal counsel, as per their
3 direction to us during the first meeting. That's the
4 Solicitor General's Office. I'm wondering how people feel
5 on the Committee about asking the Solicitor General's
6 opinion about what our purview is with regard to
7 recommendations on Indian preference hiring, and whether we
8 ought to just ask the question Do we have any authority here
9 whatsoever? And if yes, what is it? If no, who does? So
10 we can, you know, put this issue to rest, one way or the
11 other.

12 I mean, I think that people are interested in
13 knowing whether we have any authority as to that issue. If
14 we don't deal with it at this meeting, I would be willing to
15 bet that we will deal with it at the next meeting in East
16 Glacier. So if -- I'd be willing to make that motion, if I
17 think that there's any kind of support for it.

18 MR. O'QUINN: It seems to me that that
19 question just needs to be referred to the National Park
20 Service through their attorneys. I think it's outside -- I
21 think it's outside the purview of this Committee.

22 MR. SLITER: Well, I thought that we were
23 told by the Park Service that they have no -- that we don't
24 have any authority to request that their legal counsel do
25 anything for us. Our legal counsel, as per their

1 instruction during our first meeting, was that we -- we're a
2 FACA committee that reports to the Department of the
3 Interior, but we got all of our instructions through the
4 Solicitor general's Office.

5 MS. PAHL: That's right.

6 MR. SLITER: If there's an attorney out there
7 that would be able to answer this, I would think that the
8 SG's Office would be able to answer it.

9 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Bill?

10 MR. DAKIN: Well, haven't you in the past
11 lawfully and frequently given contractors an incentive to
12 hire minorities, specifically on the east side of the Park?

13 MR. BABB: We've done that.

14 MR. DAKIN: It's not exactly new ground, is
15 it?

16 MR. BABB: We've done that before, but we
17 probably could be much more aggressive, to be honest about
18 it, in doing that. And so that -- Dick's not here, but so
19 has Federal Highway tried to do that.

20 MR. DAKIN: And didn't we include in our
21 first recommendation to the Park Service that due
22 deliberation be given to creating job opportunities for
23 adjacent minorities? I think we've covered it. And I think
24 something can be done under existing customary practices.

25 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Suzann.

1 MS. LEWIS: I think there are two -- the one
2 when you look at what is the scope of authority of this
3 group, it goes to your charter, your legislation. That
4 would be the first and fundamental source, what this group
5 was asked to do. And in the broadest nature, it is asked to
6 make recommendations. It doesn't place limits on all the
7 different topics that your recommendations might want to
8 address directly to the Secretary of the Interior. So
9 my -- you know, I'm just trying to think through a logical
10 process on this that doesn't make a request to attorneys who
11 won't respond in maybe the most timely manner that this
12 Committee might need, is that in terms of understanding the
13 scope of authority, go to your legislation which exists.
14 And my interpretation of that is you have very broad
15 recommending authorities on any number of topics to the
16 Secretary of the Interior.

17 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I think Bill raises a good
18 point. In our first meeting we did encourage the emphasis
19 be given to hiring of minorities. And we're not going to
20 hire anybody. We're just going to make recommendations. So
21 we considered that at our first meeting, and we have made
22 that a part of our record --

23 MR. DAKIN: Maybe we should -- excuse me.
24 Maybe we should enter into our minutes now that we certainly
25 intend to repeat that recommendation when we get to our

1 final product.

2 CHAIRMAN OGLE: And have it included in
3 our -- yes, have it included in our final again.

4 MR. KIPP: A comment there. I think that
5 there is a advisable, amendable recommendation to make. I
6 believe the work document calls -- one thing that concerned
7 us down there was it needed 13 flaggers. We have 36
8 certified flaggers on our reservation, and not one was
9 placed.

10 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Just so long as you
11 understand, Mr. Kipp, there has not been a contractor hired
12 for the project that we are working on.

13 MR. KIPP: But I think you will be bombarded
14 with questions on your east side at the East Glacier
15 meeting. So I recommend you get an answer so you will have
16 some answers. It's something that everybody wants to know.
17 You're there and you will be confronted with that.

18 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Barney.

19 MR. O'QUINN: I think the question he's
20 raising goes beyond just minority hiring. It's not a DBE
21 goal. He's talking about treaty obligations. And, you
22 know, what the contractor does beyond this gets a little bit
23 beyond our scope. I don't think we've got any control over
24 that. The Park Service does.

25 Now, Suzann, just for clarification, are we making

1 our recommendations to the Secretary of the Interior or to
2 the National Park Service? I thought it was to the Park
3 Service.

4 MS. LEWIS: I think your legislation says
5 that the Secretary -- to make your recommendations to the
6 Secretary who is the -- for which the National Park Service
7 is an agency within the Department of Interior. I mean, he
8 is the -- within our department, he is the obligate.

9 MS. PAHL: Maybe I'm reading -- it says "The
10 purpose of the Committee is to advise the National Park
11 Service."

12 CHAIRMAN OGLE: The purpose of the Committee
13 is to advise the National Park Service. And so far, all of
14 our recommendations that we have made have been made to the
15 National Park Service. By reading this purpose in our
16 charter, I think we are duty bound to go through the
17 National Park Service.

18 MS. LEWIS: Yes.

19 CHAIRMAN OGLE: And they, if they deem it
20 appropriate, could request opinion from the Solicitor
21 General's Office on this issue. And it may well be
22 appropriate to ask for an opinion on that, but I don't think
23 we can ask directly.

24 MR. O'QUINN: I think it would be very
25 appropriate to pass that information on as part of our

1 public involvement process and information we receive as
2 information we pass on to the Park Service for their due
3 consideration.

4 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Lowell.

5 MR. MEZNARCH: I think it would be very
6 helpful for our meeting in East Glacier to be able to
7 address the public in that something has begun. Whether it
8 be Paul's motion, if we follow through with that, or Suzann
9 takes the initiative through the National Park Service, so
10 that it isn't a big, open sore, potentially, in May. So
11 that we don't have to have George come back and reiterate
12 those things and make those points all over again; that we
13 can respond to George that something has begun and it's out
14 of our hands but we hope that it is resolved before it
15 becomes a major issue with the rehabilitation.

16 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Dave.

17 MR. JACKSON: I mean, I think it's clear that
18 the three counties that they're going to look at, include
19 one of the wealthiest in the State, Flathead, one of the
20 poorest in the State, Glacier, and Lake that's probably
21 somewhere in between. And that that's got to be part of the
22 baseline economic information that they're going to have to
23 describe. And then I think they're going to have to
24 describe ways of mitigating that. And I think that that
25 should be clear, that's a part of everybody's mind set, and

1 that's what I kind of expect we'll hear next meeting.

2 MS. TOWNSEND: Everybody's looking at me. I
3 think we will definitely address mitigation strategies to go
4 to those points. To the extent that there's legal
5 interpretation of treaties, my gosh, that's another
6 department. It's not my department.

7 CHAIRMAN OGLE: We wouldn't expect that from
8 our consultant. I'm not sure if Paul made a motion or not.

9 MR. SLITER: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think I
10 will make a motion but I don't think it will be the motion
11 that I had originally intended.

12 If our charter permits us to advise the Park
13 Service, then my motion would be to recommend to the Park
14 Service that they get a legal opinion, from whoever it is
15 they get their will opinions from, the Secretary of the
16 Interior or the Solicitor General or whoever, the chief
17 counsel for the Department of the Interior with regard to
18 the treaty of 1888 and how Indian preference hiring is to be
19 treated on this job.

20 MR. MEZNARCH: Second.

21 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Discussion on the motion?
22 Tony?

23 MR. JEWETT: I would just ask Suzann how that
24 motion may interact with any other current activities and
25 discussions going on with regards to those legal treaties.

1 Because I think there are some, are there not?

2 MS. LEWIS: Well, I guess when I hear, you
3 know, that you're making a recommendation, so I would pass
4 that recommendation on to our attorney. However, whatever
5 action they may more may not take from that recommendation,
6 I don't have any control over. The reality being that I can
7 say This Advisory Committee passed a motion recommending
8 that the Park Service -- let's say I'm writing a letter to
9 our solicitors and here's what they would like to address.
10 They could come back and say We're not going to do it, or
11 they could just never say anything Which is what happens a
12 lot is my -- you know, I mean, there isn't anything
13 that -- you know, there are only two government entities
14 that can open treaties. One is the President of the United
15 States and the second is the Senate. They're the only two
16 bodies of government who can deal with treaties.

17 MR. SLITER: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, but my
18 motion is not to open any treaties. My motion is to seek
19 counsel with regard to interpretation of the treaties and
20 consider the interpretation when entering into the contract.

21 MS. LEWIS: We can pass that recommendation
22 on. But we may not have any response.

23 MR. SLITER: I don't feel we have any more
24 authority than just to make that recommendation. But we
25 might as well make the recommendation, because it needs to

1 be discussed and studied.

2 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Any further discussion on the
3 motion?

4 Dayna.

5 MS. HUDSON: Can we get the official name of
6 that treaty; the year and the title?

7 MR. KIPP: It was the 1887, ratified in 1888.

8 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Does that treaty have a name,
9 Mr. Kipp?

10 MR. KIPP: No. It's just the treaty of
11 agreement of 1887 and the agreement of 1896.

12 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Barney?

13 MR. O'QUINN: We need to get his presentation
14 and attach it to the record.

15 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Bambi has that. You can pull
16 that out, can't you?

17 MR. O'QUINN: That needs to be part of the
18 letter for the recommendation. Because the attorney's going
19 to need something to start from.

20 MR. SLITER: And I guess, as an amendment to
21 my motion, I would also request that Mr. Kipp's testimony be
22 attached to the recommendation that the Committee's making
23 to the Park Service to seek this counsel.

24 MR. MEZNARCH: Second.

25 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Is the amendment acceptable

1 to you, Lowell?

2 MR. MEZNARCH: (Nods head.)

3 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Further discussion on the
4 motion.

5 All in favor?

6 (All Committee member responde Yea.)

7 CHAIRMAN OGLE: All opposed?

8 (No response.)

9 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Motion passed.
10 Bill.

11 MR. DAKIN: I have one more question, but I
12 wanted to defer to public comment, because there are some
13 new arrivals here who might want to speak before five
14 o'clock.

15 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Is there someone who has come
16 to the meeting today wishing to make public comment or to
17 the Committee during our public comment period? Anybody who
18 wishes to make public comment that hasn't done so? Okay.

19 Thanks, Bill.

20 MR. DAKIN: The only question then that's
21 still burning in my heart, was mentioned by Barbara
22 yesterday. And that is we have never decided whether we are
23 pursuing this project to a rehabilitative or a restorative
24 standard. And I'm a little bit -- I'm not sure that the
25 work that's supposed to happen between now and next April

1 should be going ahead without some deliberation to that
2 issue.

3 Barbara, can you help me with that? It's never
4 been brought to the table. And I think we're all talking
5 rehabilitation, but it's nowhere in our record saying that.

6 MS. PAHL: What I raised yesterday is the
7 National Park Service created for the rest of the world
8 outside of the national parks standards. And they have
9 standards for stabilization, reconstruction, rehabilitation,
10 restoration, and preservation. And it seemed like as part
11 of this process, it would be useful to look at the rehab and
12 the restoration standards and decide -- I would, quite
13 frankly, be more comfortable making that decision in
14 consultation with the Advisory Council on Historic
15 Preservation and the state historical preservation officer
16 for the State of Montana and with the Park Service on, you
17 know, what they would recommend. And maybe we could
18 then -- the Committee might look at that recommendation on
19 whether they're looking at rehabilitation standards or
20 restoration standards.

21 And the only reason I bring up the restoration is
22 because it's a national historic landmark which puts it at a
23 higher level of significance than your every day,
24 run-of-the-mill national registered historic landmark.

25 MR. O'QUINN: But if you went to restoration,

1 could you not be putting yourself in a situation where you
2 would be taking up the pavement and going back to a gravel
3 road?

4 MS. PAHL: I don't think so.

5 MR. O'QUINN: You could.

6 MS. PAHL: Because you know, all those
7 standards, they're like guidelines. They're not a
8 prescriptive.

9 MR. O'QUINN: I think you're right. I think
10 is part of 106 consultation. I think you come forward with
11 a recommendation and I think we are talking rehabilitation
12 and then you get a 106 agreement out of that.

13 MS. PAHL: I think that should be part of
14 that consultation.

15 MR. DAKIN: I just felt, by never having
16 dealt with that, that there could be some work -- if we're
17 going to have construction alternatives on the table in
18 April, how does MKC and the Park Service know in what
19 framework to construct those? If it's not a big worry, it's
20 not a big worry. But --

21 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Bill, I for one, don't know
22 the difference. And there may be others on Committee who
23 don't. So it seems to me to have any kind of a productive
24 discussion about it, we would need someone to bring the
25 different standards, tell us why they're different and have

1 a little dialogue about that and maybe a little more
2 informed setting.

3 So my suggestion would be to ask the consultants
4 to, you know, bring the two sets of standards to the next
5 meeting and tell us what the differences are, and then maybe
6 the Committee can weigh in on what kind of standards we
7 expect to be addressing.

8 MS. PAHL: Mr. Chairman, can I suggest that
9 the engineering subcommittee take that up? We already
10 talked about getting a copy of the National Historic
11 Landmark nominations. There's like three nominations for
12 the road, to see what was identified as the significant
13 features. The engineering committee was going to look at
14 that. Also, I can provide them with the standards.

15 And one just caveat for Mr. Kipp. The Section 106
16 new regulations do require consultation with the tribes.
17 So -- and that process hasn't started yet, just so you don't
18 feel that that contact has not been made. But it is
19 required.

20 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Well, I think that's -- is
21 that acceptable to you, Barney, to have your engineering
22 committee to take up that?

23 MS. PAHL: Yeah, because I really think that
24 this is something that's going to be processed through with
25 the consultation of the SHIPO. But we've got to put

1 something out there to react to. We've got the right people
2 on that subcommittee.

3 MR. BABB: The way the contract reads is
4 "restoration." But we've also opened the door in regards to
5 cultural landscape -- rehabilitation, I'm sorry -- in
6 regards to the cultural landscape. They're going to be
7 making recommendations, if something should be restored, so
8 there's that part of the agreement also.

9 CHAIRMAN OGLE: So engineering work group
10 will take up that topic and coordinate with the consulting
11 standards. Good.

12 Fred asked me to make one request here. You're
13 going to be getting conceptual draft reports in April. And
14 our meeting is May 31st. And they would like to ask that
15 any comments that you have on the draft reports get to the
16 Park Service or MK by the 18th of May so that they can
17 analyze and coordinate those comments, and we can take those
18 into consideration at the meeting.

19 MR. BABB: We'd like to, if possible, have as
20 many of them as possible to do electronically. And the
21 electronic version would go to Craig, myself and Dayna, for
22 the record.

23 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Dayna.

24 MS. HUDSON: Even if you don't have a
25 comment, please E-mail saying you have no comments, so we

1 know you did get the document.

2 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Anna Marie.

3 MS. MOE: I'd just like to make a comment.

4 When you're sending out stuff, and we talked a little bit
5 about it in our committee. When you're sending out stuff
6 that requires a comment, make sure that you put it like on
7 the top, in bold letters, so that we make sure that it's
8 something that needs an immediate response versus something
9 that can be put in the to-be-read pile later.

10 MS. HUDSON: Yes.

11 CHAIRMAN OGLE: All right. I think we have
12 successfully lasted until the conclusion of our public
13 comment period.

14 Is there any further business?

15 The Chair would entertain a motion to adjourn.

16 (So moved by all Committee members.)

17 CHAIRMAN OGLE: There is a second that we
18 adjourn. All in favor?

19 (All Committee members respond aye.)

20 CHAIRMAN OGLE: So adjourned.

21 (Proceedings were concluded at 5:00 p.m.)

22

23

24 --o0o--

25